Pap 138 f R 79 Jdg 11 R 47 1
87 (45)

REPORT

OF THE

Legal Remembrancer to Government,

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH,

For the year ending 30th September 1891.

BY THE HON'BLE J. DEAS, C.S.,

Legal Remembrancer to Govt., N.-W. P. and Oudh.

ALLAHABAD:

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH GOVERNMENT PRESS.

1892.

Price Re. 1.

16

ERRATA.

In Appendix C, Statement IV (Nos. I and II)—

	Rs	a.	p.		Rs.	a.	p.
For	10,471	2	9½	*read*	10,481	2	9½
„	3,317	6	8½	„	3,318	0	8½
„	3,699	11	1½	„	3,709	11	1½
„	50,437	10	0½	„	50,438	4	0½
„	14,170	13	11	„	14,190	13	11
„	41,384	8	6½	„	41,885	2	6½
„	9,326	1	10	„	9,346	1	10
„	41,234	8	6½	„	41,235	2	6½
„	8,649	2	10	„	8,669	2	10
„	54,191	9	2½	„	54,212	5	2½

Pgs 13 GR 1/7 File 9 IR 49

REPORT

OF THE

LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT,

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH,

For the year ending 30th September 1891.

No. $\frac{3018}{F.568}$ OF 1892.

FROM

THE HON'BLE J. DEAS, C.S.,

LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT, N.-W. P. AND OUDH,

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH.

DATED NAINI TAL, THE 20TH MAY 1892.

SIR,

I HAVE the honor to submit, for the information of His Honor the Lieutenan-tGovernor, North-Western Provinces, and Chief Commissioner of Oudh, the annual report on the civil litigation to which Government was a party for the year ending 30th September 1891.

2. The total number of cases dealt with was 602, or 11 less than the number which came under review last year. Out of 393 cases decided, in 273 or 69 per cent. the decision was favourable, in 84 or 21 per cent. the result was unfavourable, and 36 cases were compromised or withdrawn. The percentage of cases that were lost in the previous year was 20 per cent.

APPENDIX A.

3. *Statement I.—Civil suits and applications to which the State was a party in the Courts of first instance.*—The State was a party in 134 cases for disposal in the Courts of first instance, against 123 in the previous year, being plaintiff or applicant in 76 and defendant in 58. Of the claims and applications which it was thought expedient for Government to prosecute, 42 or 62 per cent. were decided in its favour, six were compromised, one was withdrawn, eight are still pending, and 19 were decreed against it. The amount sought to be recovered in the 66 cases which were decided was Rs. 34,891, of which Rs. 7,766, or about 22 per cent., were decreed.

4. Of the 19 cases lost by the State, as many as 15 were references by the Collector to the Judge under the Land Acquisition Act in connection with awards of compensation for land taken up for the Dehra Dún cantonment, the Benares water works, and the Bengal and North-Western Railway at Bahraich; and three were miscellaneous applications; two of which do not appear to have been reported to this office. The one suit lost by the State was a claim by the Nazúl Department against Musammat Munder for the possession of a small plot of waste land in the town of Gonda. An appeal against the Munsif's decision is pending.

5. Of the 58 claims contested by the Secretary of State, 21 are still awaiting decision, two were withdrawn, four were compromised, and 13 were decreed against Government. The value of the claims decreed was, however, only Rs. 6,230 out of Rs. 6,41,881, which represented the value of the claims preferred and decided.

6. The following are the particulars of the cases which were decided adversely to Government :—

(1) *Ram Chand* versus *Secretary of State* (*Agra*).—In this suit the right of a "patotidár" in a Government estate in Agra to alienate his holding was disputed by Government, which had successfully resisted the application of the plaintiff decree-holder to sell the tenure in execution of a decree obtained by him against the patotidár under a mortgage deed. The plea raised by my predecessor was that the tenure of a patotidár was that of an occupancy tenant. The claim was decreed by the Munsif, and his decision was upheld in appeal by the District Judge, who held that the tenure was heritable and transferable.

(2) *Pahlad* versus *Secretary of State* (*Mainpuri*).—This was a suit for the recovery of Rs. 276, which the plaintiff alleged had been illegally recovered from him on account of land revenue by the tahsíldár of Bhongaon. The plea was that the amount had been voluntarily paid by the plaintiff in behalf of the defaulters, whose shares were hypothecated to him. This plea was, however, not established by the evidence.

(3) *Gayadin* versus *Collector of Etawah and others*.—In this suit, which was a claim for the recovery of Rs. 377 with interest by the sale of property hypothecated to the plaintiff by Musammat Sundar, deceased, the Collector was impleaded on the ground that he was in possession of the property as trustee appointed by the Judge under section 5, Regulation V, 1799. The claim of the plaintiff was decreed, but the Collector of Etawah was awarded his costs, recoverable from the property of the deceased under his charge.

(4) *Umrao Singh* versus *Secretary of State* (*Moradabad*).—In this suit the plaintiff claimed to recover Rs. 290 on account of the value of movable property, which had been attached for land revenue, but which was stated not to have been returned to the plaintiff after the land revenue demand was satisfied. The claim was contested by my predecessor, with the result that a decree was passed in plaintiff's favour for only Rs. 25. The plaintiff has filed an appeal, which is pending.

(5) *Ram Rattan* versus *Secretary of State* (*Cawnpore*).—Plaintiff, a tax collector in cantonments, was suspended and finally dismissed. He sued the Cantonment Committee for the recovery of a Government promissory note for Rs. 500 (with interest), deposited by him as security, and for Rs. 127-8-0, arrears of salary. The Cantonment Committee returned the Government promissory note to the plaintiff after the suit was filed and then reported the case to my predecessor, who advised a compromise. The Cantonment Committee did not, however, compromise the claim, and a decree for Rs. 63-12-0, arrears of pay due to the plaintiff, and for Rs. 45, interest due on the Government promissory note, was passed against it on its admission.

(6) *Mangi Lal* versus *Secretary of State* (*Fatehpur*).—The plaintiff sued for the value of trees, which Government held to be Nazúl property. He was successful in the Lower Court; but on appeal by Government his claim was dismissed by the Subordinate Judge. The plaintiff has appealed to the High Court.

(7) *Patti Ahír* versus *Secretary of State* (*Jaunpur*).—This was a claim against the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway for the recovery of Rs. 1,936 on account of the price of kankar supplied by the plaintiff to the defendant. The defendant pleaded that only Rs. 34-5-7 were due. The plaintiff's claim was decreed only to this extent, but with proportionate costs. An appeal against the order awarding costs to the plaintiff was filed by Government and was decided in its favour.

(8) *Mahant Prem Das* versus *Secretary of State* (*Fyzabad*).—Plaintiff's claim to the ownership and possession of a small plot of waste land (three biswas in area) lying in front of his Thakurdwara in Ajudhya was decreed. The claim was contested by my predecessor on the ground that the land was Nazúl property.

(9) *Ahmad-ulla* versus *Executive Engineer* (*Bahraich*).—This was a claim against the Public Works Department for the recovery of Rs. 100, balance due under a contract for the supply of bricks, and of Rs. 39-11-0, the value of bricks rejected, but subsequently used by the defendant. The claim was contested by my predecessor and resulted in a decree for Rs. 24 only, as some of the rejected bricks were proved to have been used by the defendant.

(10) *and* (11) *Ramjiawan* versus *Secretary of State* (*Cawnpore*).—Two suits were filed by the plaintiff against the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway for the recovery of the value (Rs. 52-4-0 in one and Rs. 183-8-6 in the other case) of goods lost or damaged in transit. The plea was that plaintiff had given a clear receipt, and that in leaving the goods on the railway premises after giving a clear receipt he did so at his own risk. The Munsif decreed Rs. 38-12-0 and Rs. 150 respectively. Both the plaintiff and the defendant have appealed against these decrees.

(12) *and* (13). These were decisions by the Judge in references by the Collector under the Land Acquisition Act.

7. The State was thus a party to 105 suits and applications disposed of during the year. In 32 it was "unsuccessful." Of these 32, as many as 17 were references to the District Judge under the Land Acquisition Act: three were miscellaneous applications: in two the order of the Lower Court was reversed in appeal: in two the greater portion of the claim was dismissed: in one Government was impleaded as stakeholder and was awarded its costs, and in one defence was not recommended by this office. Of the remaining six cases two are under appeal by Government.

8 *Statement II.—Appeals in District Courts to which the State was a party.*—There were seven appeals before the District Courts in which the State was appellant. Of the six appeals, valued at Rs. 5,180, two, valued at Rs. 3,047, were lost by the State, *viz.*—

(1) *Secretary of State, defendant-appellant,* versus *Ram Chand, plaintiff-respondent.*—This case has been noticed under paragraph 6(1).

(2) *Secretary of State, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Musammat Umrai, defendant-respondent.*—This was an appeal against the decision of the Munsif dismissing the claim of Government in the Nazúl Department to the ownership and possession of a small plot of waste land in Gonda. An appeal has been instituted in the Judicial Commissioner's Court against the dismissal of the appeal by the Subordinate Judge.

9. The State was respondent in seven appeals decided during the year and valued at Rs. 3,055. One was remanded to the Lower Court under section 566, Civil Procedure Code: the rest were dismissed.

10. *Statement III.—Appeals before the Privy Council, High Court, and Judicial Commissioner's Court.*—In three appeals for disposal by the High Court of Allahabad the State was appellant; one was compromised, and two are pending.

The appeal which was compromised related to the case of Secretary of State *versus* Madari Lal and others, in which the sum of Rs. 26,738 (including interest, Rs. 11,138) was claimed from the defendant on account of arrears alleged to be due under a lease of the Rájghát ferry at Allahabad (*vide* letter No. $\frac{483}{\text{XII—178C}}$, dated 24th April 1891, from the Secretary to Government, North-Western Provinces and Oudh, in the Financial Department, to the Legal Remembrancer).

11. In nine appeals before the High Court of Allahabad the State was respondent. Five (valued at Rs. 13,162-6-4) were decided, resulting in a decree for the appellant in four cases, valued at Rs. 2,659-6-4.

The four appeals in which the State was unsuccessful included two appeals against awards by the Judge under the Land Acquisition Act, in one of which the

proceedings were remanded under section 562, Civil Procedure Code. The remaining two unsuccessful appeals were—

(1) *Zakaria, plaintiff-appellant*, versus *Secretary of State, defendant-respondent*.—The District Judge of Sahárnpur dismissed plaintiff's claim for the recovery of Rs. 1,674 on account of earthwork done by him for the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, on the grounds that he had failed to prove that he did the work alleged, and that his claims up to 31st October 1885 had been paid in full. In appeal the High Court reversed this decision and decreed the claim.

(2) *Budh Ram and others, plaintiff-appellants*, versus *Secretary of State, defendant-respondent*.—The plaintiffs sued the Secretary of State to obtain a declaration that they as zamíndárs and tenants of mauza Tari, a village situated on the southern bank of the river Ganges, had a right to cross the river by a public ferry according to old custom without payment of any toll. The claim was contested by my predecessor on the plea that the plaintiffs had not been exempted by the Local Government under Act XVII, 1878. The claim was decreed by the Munsif, dismissed by the Subordinate Judge, and eventually decreed by the High Court on the ground that the plaintiffs had been exempted by the Magistrate of Gházipur in 1872, and that this order was conclusive under clause 11 of Regulation VI, 1819, read with section 2, Act XVII, 1878.

The appeal, which was dismissed and which was valued at Rs. 10,672-9-4 referred to the Judge's decision, under the Land Acquisition Act, in connection with land acquired for the water works in Benares.

12. Of the suits in original and appellate Courts in which the State was successful the following are the more important:—

(1) Two suits were brought by Jang Bahádur against Mr. Parsons, District Superintendent of Police, and Yusuf Ali, Inspector of Police, Benares, respectively, for the recovery of damages on account of the alleged illegal and malicious procedure on the part of the defendants in connection with the plaintiff's arrest and conviction under Act III, 1867. The cases were withdrawn by the plaintiff on the first day of hearing, and the costs of Government, which had undertaken the defence, were awarded against him.

(2) The District Judge of Benares dismissed the appeal of Bakhshish Ali, who unsuccessfully sued for the recovery of a sum of Rs. 1,200 from Government on the allegation that this money had been deposited with the Collector on trust in 1884.

(3) Three suits were instituted against Government for the recovery of the escheated estate of Khargapur in the Allahabad district by persons who represented themselves to be the reversionary heirs of the deceased owner. All the three suits were dismissed by the Sub-Judge, who held that the plaintiffs had failed to prove their title. Each of these suits was valued at nearly two lakhs.

(4) One Dasu Ram sued the kotwál of Farukhabad and some head constables for the recovery of Rs. 2,177 as damages for defamation, illegal arrest, assault, and malicious prosecution. The defence was undertaken by Government. The claim to the extent of Rs. 700 was decreed by the Munsif, but it was dismissed with costs by the Judge of Mainpuri, to whom the appeal was transferred by order of the High Court.

13. *Statement IV.—Realization of sums decreed in favour of the State.*—Rs. 8,998-4-2 were decreed in favor of the State during the year. Inclusive of the arrears of previous years (Rs. 21,168-1-7), there was a total demand of Rs. 30,166-5-9; of this sum Rs. 6,950-4-10, or about 23 per cent., were realized (24 per cent. in the North-Western Provinces and 5 per cent. in Oudh), a result which compares favourably with those of the two previous years. Rs. 3,225-10-8 were remitted, and the year closed with a total balance of Rs. 19,990-6-3, of which Rs. 577-15-6 are reported as irrecoverable.

14. The largest balances appear in the following districts:—

	Rs.	a.	p.
Agra	730	14	0
Etah	3,081	14	4
Allahabad	2,380	0	9
Bahraich	879	14	0
Bara Banki	631	12	0
Saháranpur	9,143	11	10

Agra.—The balance is due from Mr. Cripps under a decree for rent passed in January 1891. The judgment-debtor is reported to be without means, and there is little hope of the decree being satisfied.

Etah.—For the recovery of Rs. 1,568-11-9 the judgment-debtor's property has been proclaimed for sale: and for the recovery of the balance proceedings in execution are in progress.

Allahabad.—Rs. 2,002 represent the costs due from the claimants to the Khargapur estate [see paragraph 12(3)], whose claim is at present pending in appeal in the High Court. The balance is due from Mr. Wright, judgment-debtor, and is being paid in monthly instalments of Rs. 15.

Saháranpur.—These balances are old outstandings, Rs. 845-12-9 being due from Mr. Nulty and Rs. 8,297-15-1 from General Thelwall, whose case was explained in the report for 1888-89.

Bara Banki.—The arrear is due from one Bhup Narain, whose appeal is pending.

15. *Statement V.—Amount expended by the State in litigation as contrasted with the sums actually realized.*—In the prosecution and defence of cases the State expended Rs. 8,238-6-3, Rs. 7,24,907 being the total value in all Courts of the cases disposed of during the year: of the above sum, Rs. 4,269-14-0 represent the costs disbursed in the defence of the three suits brought for the recovery of the Khargapur estate [see paragraph 12(3)].

Rs. 7,973-5-9 were disbursed to decree-holders and Rs. 6,950-4-10 were received from judgment-debtors. In Saháranpur Rs. 3,565-5-1 were disbursed—Rs. 1,241-6-10 in compensation for land acquired for public purposes, and Rs. 2,323-14-3 on account of the decree obtained by Zaharia against the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway [see paragraph 11(1)]

In Jaunpur Rs. 1,025-12-0 were paid by the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway to Dalthamman Lunya, whose appeal was decreed in the previous year.

APPENDIX B.

MUNICIPAL.

16. *Statement I.—Suits in Courts of first instance.*—Litigation was confined almost entirely to the North-Western Provinces, the returns showing in Oudh only one case, which is pending.

Municipal Boards in the North-Western Provinces were concerned in 22 cases, of which 15 were disposed of. Of these 15, 10 were decided in their favour, and 5, in which the Boards were defendant, were lost. Two of these were contested by the Benares Municipal Board without reference to this office. The remaining three cases, which referred to the right of the plaintiff (*a*) to erect a masonry verandah, (*b*) to construct a "chabutra," and (*c*) to the ownership of a small plot of waste land, were unsuccessfully contested on pleas supported by the narratives of the Municipal Boards concerned.

17. *Statement II.—Appeals in District Courts.*—The Saháranpur and Cawnpore Municipal Boards appealed each one case. Both these appeals, valued at Rs. 11-3-0,

were lost. In the former the appeal, which was instituted on 30th June 1890, was rejected as filed beyond time. In the latter [Municipal Board, Cawnpore, defendant-appellant, *versus* Musammat Kishonia, paragraph 16(*c*)], the appeal was instituted without instructions from this office.

In nine appeals the Municipal Board was respondent. Five were decided, three adversely to the Municipal Board concerned.

In one (Dehra Dún) the right of the plaintiff to keep a sarái was decreed by the Judge of Saháranpur on 2nd December 1890, the order of the lower Court being reversed. In another case (Mainpuri) the Judge decreed to the plaintiff-appellant the ownership of a plot of waste land adjoining the Lane Tank in Mainpuri. The third case does not appear to have been reported to this office.

None of the Municipalities in Oudh were concerned in any appeal before the District Courts.

18. *Statement III.—Appeals before the High Court and Judicial Commissioner's Court.*—Three appeals were for disposal before the High Court of Allahabad, in which a Municipal Board was respondent. Two were decided, both in favour of the Municipal Board concerned.

19. *Statement IV.—Realization of sums decreed in favour of Municipal Boards.*—The total demand amounted to Rs. 3,349-5-3. Only Rs. 267-13-0 (or about 8 per cent.) were realized, and Rs. 2-11-0 were remitted, leaving a balance of Rs. 3,078-13-3, of which Rs. 216-14-9 are reported as doubtful. The largest balances are in—

	Rs.	a.	p.
Etah-Kasganj	304	9	0
Cawnpore	1,266	1	4
Benares	1,002	14	8

Etah.—These arrears are due from three judgment-debtors. The Collector reports that steps are being taken for their recovery.

Cawnpore.—Rs. 107-3-0 have been deposited in the Civil Court: Rs. 156-12-0 are due from one Mangli Prasad, who is said by the Collector to possess no property, and for the recovery of Rs. 976-13-4 proceedings in execution are in progress or are about to be undertaken.

Benares.—These balances are reported by the Collector as recoverable, the greater portion being due from one Matái Singh (see paragraph 13 of last year's report).

20. *Statement V.—Amount expended on litigation contrasted with sums actually realized by Municipal Boards.*—Against receipts, amounting to Rs. 267-13-0, Rs. 345-14-9 were disbursed by Municipal Boards in payment to decree-holders, and Rs. 480-7-10 in the prosecution and defence of suits, the value of those decided being Rs. 2,270-6-6.

APPENDIX C.

Court of Wards.

21. *Statement I.—Suits decided in Courts of original jurisdiction.*—There were 328 cases (or 19 less than in the previous year), in which the Court of Wards was a party, as plaintiff in 227 and as defendant in 99. Compared with those of the previous year, the returns show a decrease of 42 cases in the North-Western Provinces and an increase of 23 cases in Oudh. Of the 227 cases prosecuted by the Court of Wards, 155 (valued at Rs. 1,59,842) were heard and decided—19 in the North-Western Provinces and 136 in Oudh. Of the 19 cases (valued at Rs. 14,628) decided in the North-Western Provinces, one was withdrawn (an application in execution of a decree) and the remaining 18 (valued at Rs. 14,364) were decreed in favour of the Court of Wards. In Oudh 16

of the 136 cases, or about 12 per cent., were dismissed, six were withdrawn (four consequent on the release of the Sarwan estate from Court of Wards' management, and two being applications in execution of decrees), three were compromised, and in the remaining 111 the claim was decreed. The cases disposed of in Oudh aggregated Rs. 1,45,214 in value, and the Court of Wards was successful in cases valued at Rs. 1,08,390.

22. The 16 cases, entered as "lost" in Oudh were not all "suits." They include nine applications in execution decrees, which were struck off—

(a) As the application was infructuous (seven cases).

(b) As the application for the execution of a Privy Council decree for Rs. 3,699 against the judgment-debtor's surety was premature (one case). This order was reversed in appeal.

(c) As the judgment-debtor gave security pending the disposal of his appeal (one case).

Of the remaining seven cases, six were suits of an unimportant character. In one, which was dismissed on account of a deficiency in the court fee stamp, the Court of Wards was impleaded as co-plaintiff by order of the Court after the claim had been instituted by the plaintiff for the produce of a tank: in another the order of the lower Court dismissing the claim as barred by limitation was subsequently reversed in appeal: and in the remaining four cases, which were claims for sums due under bonds (one), for the ownership of trees (2), and for haq chahárum (one), the evidence adduced by the Court of Wards did not establish satisfactorily the facts represented in the narratives submitted to my predecessor. The seventh case was a claim instituted by the Mohna estate in Sultánpur against Niamat Khan and Murtaza Khan and others for the possession of four villages in avoidance of an alleged deed of gift set up by the defendants. The claim was dismissed by the District Judge of Rae Barch as barred by limitation on 4th October 1890. An appeal has been filed by the Court of Wards and is pending in the Court of the Judicial Commissioner.

23. The Court of Wards was defendant in 99 cases—23 in the North-Western Provinces and 76 in Oudh: of these 99, 57 were decided—14 in the North-Western Provinces and 43 in Oudh. The value of the decided claims was Rs. 1,41,547, and that of the claims decreed against the Court of Wards was Rs. 35,494.

Of the 57 cases that were disposed of, 11 were decided against the Court of Wards (three in the North-Western Provinces and eight in Oudh), eight were compromised (one in the North-Western Provinces and seven in Oudh), and one was withdrawn in the North-Western Provinces.

The 11 cases which were "lost" included two cases, in which defence was not recommended by this office, three miscellaneous applications of which one was not contested and another was not reported to this office, and one case in which the decree against the Gauri Shankar estate in the Gházipur district for bíghas 10 (tank land) out of bighas 26 claimed was subsequently reversed in appeal. The remaining five cases were suits, in four of which the facts which furnished the grounds of defence were not established by the evidence, and in the fifth of which the Court of Wards succeeded in its plea that the interest claimed was excessive:—

(1) *Beniram* versus *Chet Singh* (*Etah*).—The plaintiff claimed Rs. 8,568 on a bond for Rs. 3,000. The execution of the bond was admitted, but it was pleaded that the plaintiff was not entitled to compound interest. This plea was accepted, and a decree for Rs. 6,832 was passed in plaintiff's favour. In this case therefore the Court of Wards was virtually successful.

(2) *Munna Singh* versus *Rámnagar estate* (*Bara Banki*).—The plaintiff claimed the right to half the water of a certain tank. The plea raised by my predecessor that the plaintiff was entitled to a fourth share was not established.

(3) *Imami* versus *Ramnagar estate* (*Bara Banki*).—In this suit the question whether the taluqdar or the pukhtadars of a certain village were entitled to the zamindari dues of the *abádi* of the village was in issue, and was decided adversely to the estate, which was unable to establish the assertion submitted in the narrative to my predecessor that the taluqdar was the owner of the *abadi*, and was by custom entitled to these dues

(4) *Ram Bihari* versus *Suraypur estate* (*Bara Banki*) —This was a suit in the Small Cause Court for the recovery of the value of certain ornaments (Rs 167) sold to the Rani, the late guardian of the minor taluqdár The claim was decreed as the Court was satisfied that the ornaments were purchased for the taluqdar's sister

(5) *Bachu Chamar*, versus *Kurwar estate* (*Sultánpur*) —In this suit the plaintiff's claim for certain trees valued at Rs. 30 was decreed.

24 The following are the more important cases in which the Court of Wards was successful in Courts of original and appellate jurisdiction —

(1) *Gorakhpur* —In execution of a mortgage decree against Durga Dayal, the estate of Sikhi Chand had brought to sale the judgment-debtor's share of 13 annas 4 pies in mauza Amwa Uman Parshad and others, sons of Durga Dayal, sued for the recovery of their share and cancelment of the sale, on the ground that the decree obtained against their father was not binding on them. The claim was dismissed on a legal point, and is at present pending in appeal before the High Court

(2) *Muzaffarnagar* —Musammat Kulsam Bibi sued her brother for the recovery of her share by inheritance in the estates of her father. The suit was valued at Rs 7,213 and was brought against the plaintiff's brother and a large number of alienees of portions of the estate, amongst whom was the Bhandara Court of Wards' estate, representative of Ali Raza, to whom one of the villages of the estate had been usufructuarily mortgaged by the plaintiff's brother and mother The suit was dismissed on the ground that different causes of action had been improperly joined in the plaint

(3) *Etáwah* —The Roshangpur estate was successful in obtaining a decree for the redemption of certain villages. The claim was valued at Rs 7,448. An appeal by the defendants, Mansa Ram and others, is pending in the High Court.

(4) *Kheri* —The Mullanpur estate obtained in two suits decrees awarding to it the possession of a considerable tract of alluvial land The appeals on behalf of the defendants, owners of neighbouring villages, are pending in the Court of the Judicial Commissioner

(5) *Fyzabad* —The Musepur estate was respondent in two appeals before the Judicial Commissioner In one the claim by Tulsi Ram for the recovery of an alleged loan of Rs 2,029 was dismissed and in the other the decree of the Judge of Fyzabad, awarding to the estate the possession of three villages by redemption on payment of Rs 8,212, was upheld, but the amount to be paid by the estate was increased by Rs 1,918

(6) *Bara Banki*.—The Surajpur estate obtained a decree for Rs 7,179 against Kunj Bihari, and one for Rs 4,914 against Dan Bahádur Singh, on account of loans made by Rani Chabraj Kuari, the mother and late guardian of the minor taluqdar Dan Bahadur Singh appealed, but was unsuccessful.

(7) *Kheri* —The Khairigarh estate obtained many decrees for considerable sums due on bonds and mortgage deeds executed in favour of the late proprietor of the estate

25 *Statement II —Appeals in District Courts* —The District Appellate Courts had before them 41 cases for disposal—11 in the North-Western Provinces and 30 in Oudh. In 13 the Court of Wards was appellant, and in 28 it was respondent Of

the 13 appeals instituted by the Court of Wards, nine valued at Rs. 1,08,179 were decided, with the result that five valued at Rs. 3,560 were decreed in favour of the Court of Wards. Three appeals were lost in the North-Western Provinces, and one in Oudh :—

(1) *Murari Lal's estate* versus *Nanak Chand, Meerut.*—Nanak Chand sued for the recovery of Rs. 552 on account of his share of the profits of two villages, and obtained a decree for Rs. 519 on 20th December 1889. Against this decree an appeal was instituted by the estate on 13th March 1890. The District Judge, however, upheld the finding of the lower Court regarding the accounts of the parties and dismissed the appeal.

(2) *Secretary of State, plaintiff-appellant,* versus *Shaikh Hinga, defendant-respondent.*—A suit was instituted on 4th November 1890 against Shaikh Hingh, a tenant in Government land (confiscated estates), for the possession of eight biswas of land on the allegation that defendant had encroached to this extent on lands adjoining his field. The claim to the extent of bighas 3-8 was decreed. Both parties appealed unsucessfully against this decision.

(3) *Mohib Ali Khan's estate, defendant-appellant,* versus *Humayun Tajdar Begum, plaintiff-respondent* (*Moradabad*).—This was an appeal filed in the Appellate Court of the Rámpur state against the decree of the lower Court in that state, decreeing the plaintiff's claim for dower valued at Rs. 1,04,000. The appeal was dismissed by the Rámpur Court.

(4) *Kurwar estate, defendant-appellant,* versus *Raghubar, plaintiff-respondent.*—This unsuccessful appeal referred to the ownership of a tree and was not recommended by this office.

26. Of the 28 appeals in which the Court of Wards was respondent, 15 (valued at Rs. 22,630) were decided, one being compromised and 14 being decreed in favour of the Court of Wards. As appellant and respondent the Court of Wards was thus unsuccessful in four of the 24 appeals heard and determined.

27. *Statement III.—Appeals before the Privy Council, High Court, and Judicial Commissioner's Court.*—The Court of Wards was a party to 34 appeals for disposal in higher appellate Courts—as appellant in 12 (four in North-Western Provinces and eight in Oudh), and as respondent in 22 (18 in North-Western Provinces and four in Oudh). Nine appeals were decided, one being compromised, and five being lost by the Court of Wards (two in North-Western Provinces and three in Oudh). Exclusive of the one case which was compromised and which was valued at Rs. 3,16,800, the value of the eight appeals decided was Rs. 20,357, and that of the appeals lost was Rs. 13,073.

The following were the appeals in which the Court of Wards was unsuccessful .—

(1) *Ramnagar estate, defendant-appellant,* versus *Mubarak Ali* (*plaintiff-respondent*).—This was an appeal to the Judicial Commissioner against the order of the District Judge decreeing under section 113, Civil Procedure Code, a claim brought under section 9, Act 1, 1877.

(2) *Mahona estate* versus *Musammat Rampiari.*—An unsuccessful application was made in revision to the Judicial Commissioner against the concurrent findings of the original and lower appellate Courts in favour of Musammat Rampiari's claim to the possession of land equal in value to the plot mortgaged to her, or for payment of money due on the mortgage.

(3) *Khapradih estate, defendant-appellant,* versus *Ramsarup, plaintiff-respondent.*—Plaintiff's claim for the possession of a grove was dismissed, but was decreed in appeal by the Judge on 11th April 1889, on the ground that the plaintiff's continuous adverse possession had been proved. In 1889 an appeal was filed in the Court of the Judicial Commissioner under instructions from my predecessor against the decision of the District Judge, on the grounds that the finding regarding plaintiff's adverse

possession was incorrect, and that the claim was barred by section 43, Civil Procedure Code. The Judicial Commissioner, however, dismissed the appeal.

(4) *Param Sukh, defendant-appellant,* versus *Harchandpur estate, plaintiff-respondent.*—The estate of Harchandpur obtained on 21st May 1889, a decree against the defendant Param Sukh for the redemption of [a village on payment of Rs. 6,980, the defendant's claim to interest from 1876 to 1885, when he obtained possession of the village as mortgagee, being disallowed. The defendant appealed to the High Court on 22nd June 1889, against the disallowance of interest for those years, and was successful in his appeal.

(5) *Jadunath Singh, defendant-appellant,* versus *Partab Chand's estate, plaintiff-respondent.*—On behalf of Partab Chand's estate a suit was instituted against Jadunath Singh for the recovery of Rs. 2,353-9-3 on a simple mortgage deed. The Subordinate Judge on 6th August 1889 decreed only Rs. 5-8-0, holding that the mortgagor had agreed to accept Rs. 2,600 in satisfaction of the mortgage debt, and that of this sum Rs. 2,594-8-0 had been paid to the mortgagor. Against this decree the plaintiff appealed to the Judge, who allowed the appeal. The High Court, however, on the appeal of the defendant, dismissed a considerable portion of the claim.

28. Musammat Baghelin brought a suit for the recovery of the Rawatpur estate in the Cawnpore district on the allegation that she was its rightful owner, as Shuratan Singh, the minor proprietor, was not a lawfully adopted son to her deceased husband. The claim was dismissed by the Sub-Judge. The plaintiff appealed to the High Court of Allahabad, the value of the suit being Rs. 3,16,800. Under advice from counsel, the Board of Revenue compromised the claim, securing to Shuratan Singh the grant of villages with assets amounting to one-fourth of the net profits of the estate.

29. *Statement IV.—Realization of sums decreed in favour of the Court of Wards.*—Inclusive of Rs. 56,464-7-11, decreed during the year, the total demand amounted to Rs. 1,60,079-2-1. Of this sum Rs. 38,524-6-4 or 24 per cent. were realized, and Rs. 3,503-5-5 remitted, leaving a balance of Rs. 1,18,051-4-4½, of which Rs. 6,829-10-6 are reported irrecoverable and Rs. 1,692-5-8 doubtful. In the North-Western Provinces the collections (23½ per cent.) compare favourably with those of the previous year (8½ per cent.), while in Oudh they fell from 31 per cent. to 24 per cent.

The heaviest balances are in the following districts :—

(1) *Murari Lal's estate, Meerut, Rs.* 4,544.—Rs. 4,135 were recovered and credited in the Civil Court before the close of the year.

(2) *Partab Chand's estate, Allahabad, Rs.* 10,013.—Rs. 1,127 have been paid into the Civil Court : and for the recovery of the balance proceedings in execution are pending, proclamation for the sale of the judgment-debtor's immovable property having been issued for the recovery of Rs. 6,377-12-6 due in two cases, from Dal Bahádur Singh and Ramapat respectively.

(3) *Gauri Skankar's estate, Gházipur, Rs.* 22,985.—Rs. 470-7-0 represent the costs due in a case which is pending in appeal before the High Court. For the recovery of Rs. 22,515 due from Sarju Parshad proceedings in execution are pending in the Sarun district.

(4) *Majhauli estate, Gorakhpur, Rs.* 2,912.—Of this sum, Rs. 2,894 are due from Lachman Rai, whose property has been attached.

(5) *Mailaraiganj estate, Bara Banki, Rs.* 2,556.—The arrear represents costs in one case. Execution proceedings are in progress.

(6) *Surajpur estate, Bara Banki, Rs.* 15,788.—This sum represents balances in some 28 cases, in most of which proceedings in execution are pending.

(7) *Bihari's estate, Bara Banki, Rs.* 3,173.—Proceedings in execution have been instituted against Shankar Bakhsh Singh, the judgment-debtor.

(8) *Khairigarh estate, Kheri, Rs.* 26,188.—This sum represents balances due in 20 cases, in most of which proceedings in execution are in progress.

30. *Statement V.—Amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums realized.*—The receipts aggregated Rs. 38,541, against Rs. 28,951 in the previous year. In the prosecution and defence of cases Rs. 24,929 were expended against Rs. 26,947 in the previous year. The value of the cases decided during the year was Rs. 7,59,355.

Etáwah, Harchandpur.—The sum of Rs. 3,088 was paid to Param Sukh, decree-holder.

Roshanghar.—Rs. 389 were disbursed in the prosecution of the claim against Mansa Ram.

Moradabad, Mohib Ali Khan's estate.—Rs. 5,200 represent the charges incurred in the litigation with Hamayun Tajdar Begam in the Court of the Rámpur state.

Bareilly, Mashuk Mahal Begam's estate.—Rs. 1,113 were paid to Shib Lal, decree-holder.

Fatehpur, Kasimpur estate.—Rs. 1,270 were expended in defending in the High Court the appeal of Chaudhri Basharat Husain *versus* Kasimpur estate.

Cawnpore, Rawatpur estate.—The charges in the appeal of Musammat Baghelin *versus* Rawatpur estate before the High Court amounted to Rs. 1,032.

Gorakhpur, Sukher Chand's estate.—Rs. 1,343 were disbursed in the case of Uman Parshad *versus* the Court of Wards, and Rs. 1,012 in the claim against Sant Sahai, which is still pending.

Bara Banki, Surajpur estate.—In the prosecution of 47 cases and the defence of 17 cases Rs. 1,248 and Rs. 548 were respectively disbursed.

Kheri, Khairigarh estate.—Rs. 3,568 were disbursed in prosecuting 45 cases and two regular appeals.

Sitapur, Akbarpur estate.—Rs. 1,505 were refunded to Hashmat Ali owing to a modification of the appellate Court of the order of the lower Court: and Rs. 1,634 were paid to Banke Lal, decree-holder.

Sultánpur, Mahona estate.—In the prosecution of the claim against Niamat Khan and others, and in the appeal (which is pending), Rs. 1,245 were disbursed: Rs. 683 were paid to Musammat Rampiari, decree-holder.

APPENDIX E.

Progress made in realizing Government dues in pauper suits.—The outstanding balance at the commencement of the year was Rs. 21,605, and during the year under report the sum of Rs. 34,911 became due to Government. Of the total dues amounting to Rs. 56,515, Rs. 7,243 (or 13 per cent. against 20 per cent. in the previous year) were recovered, and Rs. 13,123 (23 per cent. against 34 per cent. in the previous year) were expunged as irrecoverable. The year thus closed with a balance of Rs. 36,149.

The districts in which balances exceed Rs. 1,000 are—

	Rs.
(1) Aligarh	1,151
(2) Muttra	1,134
(3) Agra	4,078
(4) Etah	1,088
(5) Moradabad	3,944
(6) Cawnpore	2,257
(7) Allahabad	5,648
(8) Jaunpur	4,572
(9) Benares	1,149
(10) Sultánpur	1,510

Miscellaneous.—The following changes occurred in the office of District Government Pleaders during the year :—

The Government Pleaders of Benares and Meerut being appointed to officiate as Munsifs, Babu Jogendro Nath was appointed to officiate at Benares, and Ajudhya Parshad at Meerut. Vacancies having occurred at Bulandshahr and Cawnpore owing to the resignation of Kishori Lal and Mr. Roberts, Shu Charan Lal and Khetter Nath Ghose were appointed at Bulandshahr and Cawnpore respectively. Six months' leave was granted to the Government Pleader of Allahabad, and Kuar Parmanand was appointed to act in his stead. The reconstitution of Judgeships in Oudh led to the creation of two additional Government Pleaderships,—one at Gonda, and the other at Hardoi. Shu Narain Lal was selected for the former, and Shu Sahai for the latter post. Din Dayal was appointed Government Pleader of Kumaun.

With the exception of about two months (from 1st October to 3rd December), the office has been under my charge during the whole of the year under report.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

J. DEAS,

Legal Remembrancer to Government,

N.-W. Provinces and Oudh.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of Civil Suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Court of First Instance between October the 1st, 1890, and September the 30th, 1891.*

Division.	District.	State, Plaintiff.									State, Defendant.								
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT	Dehra Dún	2	2,087 1 3	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	23 5 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	23 5 0
	Muzaffarnagar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	30 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Meerut	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,461 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,461 4 0
	Aligarh	1	1,215 0 0	...	(1d)	...	...	...	...	...	1	43 4 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Muttra	7	9,660 11 2	5	...	...	...	739 6 6	2	8,921 4 8	3	32,295 3 0	2	...	...	...	...	1	105 5 0
AGRA	Agra	1	624 0 0	1	...	...	...	624 0 0	...	...	2	5,248 3 0	...	1	...	...	(e)2,920 12 0	1	2,327 7 0
	Farukhabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	371 0 0	...	1	...	...	371 0 0	...	...
	Etah	1	(e) 722 10 9	1	...	...	...	722 10 9	...	...	1	161 9 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Mainpuri	2	863 12 0	1	...	...	...	225 0 0	1	296 15 0	3	54,017 2 11	...	1	1	...	256 3 2	1	53,241 9 0
	Etáwah	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	402 4 0	...	1	...	...	387 3 0	...	...
ROHILKHAND	Bijnor	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	12,150 9 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	12,150 9 6
	Moradabad	2	165 11 3	2	...	...	...	165 11 3	...	...	1	290 0 0	...	1	...	...	25 0 0	...	...
	Sháhjahánpur	2	2,419 8 8	...	(1b)	...	...	...	1	2,419 8 8	1	No value given.	...	...	...	1	...	...	...
	Cawnpore	2	79 0 0	2	...	...	...	79 0 0	...	...	5	2,682 10 6	...	3	...	...	797 8 7	2	1,789 5 6
ALLAHABAD	Fatehpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	40 0 0	1	1	...	...	20 0 0	...	...
	Allahabad	1	402 0 0	1	...	...	...	402 0 0	...	...	3	5,93,126 4 5	3	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Jhánsi	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	350 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	350 0 0
BENARES	Benares	31	17,847 12 9	20	8	2	1	3,426 5 11	...	...	4	4,147 11 6	...	...	2	...	...	2	4,000 0 0
	Jaunpur	1	104 9 6	...	...	...	...	...	1	104 9 6	1	1,936 4 0	...	1	...	...	34 5 7	...	...
	Ballia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	439 12 10	3	...	...	...	...	1	305 12 4
	Mirzapur	1	No value given	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	7,660 0 0	...	1	...	...	1,094 2 3	...	...
GORAKHPUR	Gorakhpur	4	264 1 5	3	1	...	...	41 2 6	...	...	1	5,100 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	5,100 0 0
	Total, N.-W. Provinces	58	36,455 14 9	36	14	2	1	6,425 4 11	5	11,742 5 10	40	7,22,976 7 8	12	11	3	1	5,906 2 7	13	81,854 9 4
	OUDH.																		
LUCKNOW	Lucknow	1	No value given	...	...	...	...	...	1	No value given.	2	116 0 0	...	...	...	1	...	1	67 0 0
	Sitapur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	(f) 19 1 0	2	...	...	...	...	1	No value given.
	Kheri	4	5,721 9 1	2	...	...	...	686 0 0	2	5,025 1 1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
FYZABAD	Fyzabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	8	(e) 576 11 0	3	1	...	...	300 0 0	4	243 8 0
	Bahraich	8	8,699 10 11	...	4	4	...	...	...	...	3	395 11 7	...	1	1	...	24 0 0	1	56 0 0
	Gonda	2	127 0 0	1	1	...	...	1 0 0	...	...	1	18 8 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bara Banki	1	560 0 0	1	...	...	...	560 0 0	...	...	1	505 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	505 0 0
	Partábgarh	2	94 5 11	2	...	...	...	94 5 11	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh	18	15,202 9 11	6	5	4	...	1,341 5 11	3	5,025 1 1	18	1,630 15 7	6	2	1	1	324 0 0	8	871 8 0
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh	76	51,658 8 8	42	19	6	1	7,766 10 10	8	16,767 6 11	58	7,24,607 7 3	18	13	4	2	6,230 2 7	21	82,726 1 4

(a) The value of six pending cases erroneously shown as Rs. 593-5-0 in previous year.
(b) No value given in this suit.
(c) The State was erroneously shown as plaintiff in the previous year.
(d) This suit was decided before the close of last year, but the result was not reported in time, hence shown pending.
(e) The value of this suit was shown as Rs. 381-6-0 in the previous report.
(f) This suit was erroneously shown as decided last year. The State was also incorrectly shown as plaintiff.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT II.—*Return of Civil Suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by District Courts of Appeal between October the 1st, 1890, and September the 30th, 1891.*

Division.	District.	State, Appellant.									State, Respondent.								
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.							Rs. a. p.
MEERUT	Dehra Dún	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	148 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Muzaffarnagar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	30 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Meerut	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	290 10 10	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
AGRA	Agra	1	2,920 12 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Farukhabad	1	1,500 0 0	1	...	...	...	1,500 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND	Bijnor	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	100 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Moradabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	395 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	395 0 0
ALLAHABAD	Fatehpur	1	20 0 0	1	...	...	...	20 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
BENARES	Jaunpur	1	30 7 6	1	...	...	...	30 7 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Benares	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1,917 13 9	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
GORAKHPUR	Azamgarh	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	112 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	112 0 0
	Total, N.-W. Provinces	4	4,471 3 6	3	1	...	...	1,550 7 6	...	...	10	3,002 8 7	6	...	...	...	...	4	507 0 0
	OUDH.																		
LUCKNOW	Kheri	1	705 0 0	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
FYZABAD	Gonda	2	127 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	1	123 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bara Banki	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	560 0 0	(b)1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh	3	832 0 0	...	1	...	1	...	1	123 0 0	1	560 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh	7	5,303 3 6	3	2	...	1	1,550 7 6	1	123 0 0	11	3,562 8 7	7	...	...	...	...	4	507 0 0

(b) Remander to lower Court under section 566, Criminal Procedure Code.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which the State was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, North-Western Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1890, and September the 30th, 1891.*

Division.	District.	State, Appellant.								State, Respondent.									
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
				For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.						For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.			
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Sahâranpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	(b)1,968 13 0	...	1	...	...	1,965 13 0	...	...
AGRA	Farukhabad	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	*1	371 0 0	...	1	...	...	371 0 0	...	...
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	6,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	6,000 0 0
ALLAHABAD ...	Fatehpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	...	..	...	...	...	1	20 0 0
	Allahabad	1	26,738 6 4	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	...	...	...
BENARES ...	Benares	1	5,094 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	5,094 0 0	3	10,672 9 4	1	1	...	...	172 9 4	1	No value given.
	Ghâzipur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	150 0 0	...	1	...	...	150 0 0	...	...
	Ballia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,100 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,100 0 0
GORAKHPUR ...	Gorakhpur	1	(a) 185 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	185 4 0	...	...	...	...	...		...	...	...
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	3	32,017 10 4	...	...	1	...	...	2	5,279 4 0	9	21,282 6 4	1	4	...	...	2,659 6 4	4	8,120 0 0
	OUDH.																		
	Nil.																		
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh...	3	32,017 10 4	...	...	1	...	...	2	5,279 4 0	9	21,282 6 4	1	4	...	...	2,659 6 4	4	8,120 0 0

* This appeal appears in statement I, being remanded under section 562, Civil Procedure Code.

(a) The value as shown in the vernacular original decree.
(b) Wrongly shown in Statement II. The value is Rs. 1,968 and not as entered last year.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT IV (No. 1).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the State was realized or remitted during the year* 1890-91, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1891.

Division.	District.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1890.			Awarded to State between 1st October 1890 and 30th September 1891.			Total.			Realized during 1890-91.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.												
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur ...	9,576 0 4	...	(d) 323 5 6	...	...	236 0 6	9,576 0 4	...	559 6 0	29 2 0	...	530 4 6
	Muzaffarnagar ...	...	...	...	...	...	9 10 0	...	...	9 10 0	...	...	7 10 0
	Meerut ...	...	...	...	...	...	17 9 3	...	...	17 9 3	...	...	...
	Muttra ...	...	...	...	124 0 0	0 11 0	167 14 6	124 0 0	0 11 0	167 14 6	24 0 0	0 11 0	107 1 0
	Agra ...	...	...	47 6 0	624 0 0	...	66 14 0	624 0 0	...	114 4 0	...	...	6 14 0
AGRA ...	Farukhabad ...	...	...	(c) ...	...	...	413 14 0	...	...	413 14 0	...	...	413 14 0
	Etah ...	2,907 7 7	307 10 0	346 0 6	722 10 9	...	361 7 6	3,630 2 4	307 10 0	707 8 0	440 0 0	66 7 0	156 15 0
	Mainpuri ...	...	...	...	225 0 0	3 13 0	64 11 0	225 0 0	3 13 0	64 11 0	...	...	...
	Etáwah ...	...	...	...	...	...	22 9 0	...	...	22 9 0	...	...	22 9 0
	Bijnor ...	...	...	...	...	0 13 0	28 1 0	...	0 13 0	28 1 0	...	0 13 0	25 13 0
ROHILKHAND ...	Moradabad ...	...	...	775 9 0	...	...	34 3 6	...	...	809 12 6	...	...	422 4 6
	Bareilly ...	156 14 5	...	...	...	10 0 0	...	156 14 5	10 0 0	...	...	...	...
	Cawnpore ...	70 0 0	...	9 0 0	...	...	...	70 0 0	...	9 0 0	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD ...	Fatehpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	39 8 0	...	...	39 8 0	...	...	...
	Báuda ...	313 6 9	71 13 8	(a) 39 12 2	...	...	...	313 6 9	71 13 8	39 12 2	...	...	...
	Allahabad ...	1,198 0 5	580 15 5	348 6 0	351 12 0	80 1 10	3,196 12 0	1,549 12 5	661 1 3	3,545 2 0	54 9 3	...	1,192 6 0
	Benares ...	...	...	427 10 0	...	...	126 10 3	...	...	554 4 3	...	...	259 12 3
	Jaunpur ...	...	...	(c) ...	...	...	104 9 6	...	...	104 9 6	...	...	...
BENARES ...	Ballia ...	...	...	(b) 2,754 9 9	...	...	152 12 4	...	...	2,907 6 1	...	...	2,474 6 8
	Mirzapur ...	...	...	...	20 5 6	0 1 6	...	20 5 6	0 1 6	...	20 5 6	0 1 6	...
	Gházipur ...	...	...	88 14 6	...	...	3 1 9	...	...	92 0 3	...	...	3 1 9
GORAKHPUR ...	Azamgarh ...	400 0 0	73 9 4	69 7 3	...	...	35 4 1	400 0 0	73 9 4	104 11 4	400 0 0	73 9 4	104 11 4
	Total, N.-W. Provinces...	14,621 13 6	1,034 0 5	5,230 0 8	2,067 12 3	95 8 4	5,081 8 2	16,689 9 9	1,129 8 9	10,311 8 10	968 0 9	141 9 10	5,727 11 0
	OUDH.												
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow ...	...	...	3 0 0	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	3 8 0	...	...	3 8 0
	Rae Bareli ...	21 1 0	...	6 8 0	...	...	...	21 1 0	...	6 8 0	...	...	...
	Sitápur ...	...	...	19 1 0	...	...	8 11 3	...	...	27 12 3	...	...	20 2 0
	Kheri ...	...	...	...	25 0 0	...	43 11 9	25 0 0	...	43 11 9	25 0 0	...	43 11 9
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	29 4 0	...	...	29 4 0	...	...	6 15 0
	Bahraich ...	...	...	...	879 14 0	...	10 10 6	879 14 0	...	10 10 6	...	...	10 10 6
	Gonda ...	...	...	...	...	...	3 0 0	...	...	3 0 0	...	...	3 0 0
	Bara Banki ...	...	...	...	560 0 0	...	71 12 0	560 0 0	...	71 12 0	...	...	...
	Partábgarh ...	175 2 0	25 1 0	32 6 0	94 5 11	11 8 0	15 2 0	269 7 11	36 9 0	47 8 0	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	196 3 0	25 1 0	60 15 0	1,559 3 11	11 8 0	182 11 6	1,755 6 11	36 9 0	243 10 6	25 0 0	...	87 15 3
	TOTAL, N.-W. P. & OUDH,	14,818 0 6	1,059 1 5	5,290 15 8	3,627 0 2	107 0 4	5,264 3 8	18,445 0 8	1,166 1 9	10,555 3 4	993 0 9	141 9 10	5,815 10 3

(a) The difference, Rs. 5-13-0, was erroneously included in last year's balance.

(b) This balance includes Rs. 26-9-6 not included last year.

(c) The previous year's balance was struck off on appeal.

(d) Last year's balance was incorrectly shown by Collector.

(e) The previous year's balance was struck off on appeal.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT IV. (No, II).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the State was realized or remitted during the year* 1890-91, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1891—(concluded).

Division.	District.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net Total.			Analysis of Balance.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable	Irrecoverable	Doubtful.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur	9,546 14 4	...	29 1 6	403 2 6	...	29 1 6	9,143 11 10	...	...	9,143 11 10	...	...
	Muzaffarnagar ...	...	...	2 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	2 0 0	2 0 0	...	...
	Meerut	...	...	17 9 3	...	...	17 9 3	...	...	...	...	...	...
AGRA ...	Muttra	100 0 0	...	60 13 6	...	...	...	100 0 0	...	60 13 6	160 13 6	...	...
	Agra	624 0 0	...	107 6 0	...	...	0 8 0	624 0 0	...	106 14 0	730 14 0	...	...
	Etah	3,190 2 4	241 3 0	550 9 0	...	...	...	3,190 2 4	241 3 0	550 9 0	3,981 14 4	...	...
	Mainpuri	225 0 0	3 13 0	64 11 0	...	...	...	225 0 0	3 13 0	64 11 0	293 8 0	...	...
ROHILKHAND,	Bijnor	...	...	2 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	2 4 0	...	2 4 0	...
	Moradabad	...	...	387 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	387 8 0	387 1 0	0 7 0	...
	Bareilly	156 14 5	10 0 0	...	...	...	...	156 14 5	10 0 0	...	166 14 5	...	...
ALLAHABAD,	Cawnpore	70 0 0	...	9 0 0	...	...	...	70 0 0	...	9 0 0	79 0 0	...	...
	Fatehpur	...	...	39 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	39 8 0	39 8 0	...	...
	Bánda	313 6 9	71 13 8	39 12 2	313 6 9	71 13 8	31 10 2	...	...	8 2 0	8 2 0	...	...
	Allahabad	1,495 3 2	661 1 3	2,352 12 0	1,126 0 5	586 4 3	224 13 0	369 2 9	74 13 0	2,127 15 0	2,380 0 9	191 14 0	...
BENARES ...	Benares	...	...	294 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	294 8 0	...	294 8 0	...
	Jaunpur	...	...	104 9 6	...	...	...	...	...	104 9 6	104 9 6	...	...
	Ballia	...	...	432 15 5	...	...	399 9 11	...	...	33 5 6	33 5 6	...	...
	Gházipur	...	...	88 14 6	...	...	...	...	...	88 14 6	...	(a)88 14 6	...
	Total, N.-W. Provinces...	15,721 9 0	987 14 11	4,583 13 10	1,842 9 8	658 1 11	703 3 10	13,878 15 4	329 13 0	3,880 10 0	17,511 6 10	577 15 6	...
	OUDH.												
LUCKNOW ...	Rae Bareli	21 1 0	...	6 8 0	21 1 0	...	...	...	...	6 8 0	6 8 0	...	...
	Sitapur	...	...	7 10 3	...	...	0 10 3	...	...	7 0 0	7 0 0	...	...
	Fyzabad	...	...	22 5 0	...	...	...	...	...	22 5 0	22 5 0	...	...
FYZABAD ...	Bahraich	879 14 0	...	...	...	...	...	879 14 0	...	...	879 14 0	...	...
	Bára Banki	560 0 0	...	71 12 0	...	...	...	560 0 0	...	71 12 0	631 12 0	...	...
	Partábgarh	269 7 11	36 9 0	47 8 0	...	...	...	269 7 11	36 9 0	47 8 0	353 8 11	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	1,730 6 11	36 9 0	155 11 3	21 1 0	...	0 10 3	1,709 5 11	36 9 0	155 1 0	1,900 15 11	...	...
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh,	17,451 15 11	1,024 7 11	4,739 9 1	1,863 10 8	658 1 11	703 14 1	15,588 5 3	366 6 0	4,035 11 0	19,412 6 9	577 15 6	...

(a) This balance has been written off as irrecoverable.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the State under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1890 and 30th September 1891.*

Division.	District.	Receipts.	Nature of disbursements.				Remarks.
			Amount, including costs, awarded against the State in regular suits.	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total.	
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
MEERUT ...	Saháranpur	559 6 6	3,565 5 1	33 8 0	9 1 0	3,607 1	
	Muzaffarnagar ...	7 10 0	...	...	7 9 0	7 9 0	
	Meerut	*Nil.*	...	...	387 13 3	387 13 3	
	Aligarh	...	...	...	2 8 0	2 8 0	
AGRA ...	Muttra	131 12 0	...	109 6 6	23 8 0	102 14 6	
	Agra	6 14 0	...	47 0 0	69 12 6	116 12 6	
	Farukhabad ...	413 14 0	126 1 0	...	10 6 0	136 7 0	
	Etah	663 6 0	100 10 3	58 13 0	167 11 0	327 2 3	
	Mainpuri	*Nil.*	250 0 0	65 0 0	30 0 0	345 0 0	
	Etáwah	22 9 0	...	...	24 13 6	24 13 6	
ROHILKHAND ...	Bijnor	26 10 0	...	...	105 8 0	105 8 0	
	Moradabad	422 4 6	806 2 3	3 2 6	162 15 3	972 4 0	
	Bareilly	*Nil.*	9 0 0	*Nil.*	*Nil.*	9 0 0	
	Sháhjahánpur ...	*Nil.*	582 6 0	58 8 0	2 7 0	643 5 0	
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore	*Nil.*	689 12 6	...	34 9 6	724 6 0	
	Fatehpur	*Nil.*	...	13 10 0	24 8 0	38 2 0	
	Allahabad	1,246 15 3	48 6 0	22 7 6	5,606 0 6	5,677 7 0	
BENARES ...	Benares	259 12 3	480 10 0	266 12 0	20 12 3	768 2 3	
	Jaunpur	*Nil.*	1,025 12 0	8 13 0	5 0 0	1,039 15 0	
	Ballia	2,474 6 8	...	...	146 11 6	146 11 6	
	Mirzapur	20 7 0	...	5 9 3	16 4 0	21 13 3	
	Gházipur	3 1 0	...	...	2 11 3	2 11 3	
GORAKHPUR ...	Gorakhpur	*Nil.*	15 10 0	...	1 8 0	17 2 0	
	Azamgarh	578 4 8	...	4 1 0	...	4 1 0	
	Total, N.-W. Provinces...	6,837 5 7	7,099 11 1	756 10 9	6,863 0 6	15,319 6 4	
	OUDH.						
LUCKNOW ...	Lucknow	3 8 6	7 15 6	...	...	7 15 6	
	Sitapur	20 2 0	...	...	1 1 3	1 1 3	
	Kheri	68 11 9	...	218 5 3	...	218 5 3	
FYZABAD ...	Fyzabad	6 15 0	...	...	19 9 3	19 9 3	
	Bahraich	10 10 6	224 4 3	203 6 0	51 15 3	479 9 6	
	Gonda	3 0 0	41 6 11	20 14 9	2 8 0	64 13 8	
	Bara Banki	*Nil.*	...	85 13 3	...	85 13 3	
	Partábgarh	*Nil.*	...	15 2 0	...	15 2 0	
	Total, Oudh ...	112 15 3	273 10 8	543 3 3	75 1 9	892 5 8	
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh,	6,950 4 10	7,073 5 9	1,300 4 0	938 2 3	16,211 12 0	

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of Civil Suits to which the Municipal Board was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of First Instance between October the 1st, 1890, and September the 30th, 1891.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Municipal Board, Plaintiff.									Municipal Board, Defendant.								
			Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún ...	Dehra Dún ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	78 12 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Ditto ...	Mussooree ...	1	1,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Meerut ...	Gháziabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	695 0 0	1	2	...	...	101 8 0	...	...
	Etah ...	Kásganj ...	3	273 4 9	...	...	...	...	...	3	273 4 9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND,	Sháhjahánpur...	Sháhjahánpur...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	No value given.	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD,	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	275 0 0	1	1	...	...	35 0 0	1	100 0 0
	Fatehpur ...	Fatehpur ...	1	No value given.	1	...	...	...	No value given.	...	...	1	50 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
BENARES ...	Jaunpur ...	Jaunpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	17 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	17 0 0
	Benares ...	Benares ...	2	73 15 0	2	...	...	...	73 15 0	...	...	4	482 0 0	1	2	...	...	47 0 0	1	25 0 0
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		7	1,347 3 9	3	...	...	...	73 15 0	4	1,273 4 9	15	1,217 12 0	7	5	...	...	183 8 0	3	142 0 0
	OUDH.																			
FYZABAD ...	Bahraich ...	Bahraich ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	5 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	5 0 0
	Total, Oudh ...		...	...	...	...		...	...	...	...	1	5 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	5 0 0
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh ...		7	1,347 3 9	3	...	...	...	73 15 0	4	1,273 4 9	16	1,222 12 0	7	5	...	...	183 8 0	4	147 0 0

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT II.—*Return of Civil Suits to which the Municipal Board was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by District Courts of Appeal between October the 1st, 1890, and September the 30th, 1891.*

Division.	District.	Municipality	Municipal Board, Appellant.									Municipal Board, Respondent.								
			Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
					For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.						For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.			
	N.-W. PROVINCES.			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p					Rs. a. p		Rs. a. p.
MEERUT ...	Dehra Dún ...	Dehra Dún ...	..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	78 12 0	...	1	...	...	78 12 0	...	...
	Saháranpur ...	Saháranpur ...	1	6 3 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Meerut ...	Gháziabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	195 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	2	95 0 0
	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	700 0 0	...	1	...	...	700 0 0	...	...
ROHILKHAND,	Moradabad ...	Moradabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	130 0 0	...	1	...	...	50 0 0	...	...
ALLAHABAD,	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	1	35 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2	176 4 6	1	...	...	...	...	1	130 0 0
	OUDH.																			
	Nil.																			
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		2	41 3 0	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	9	1,300 0 6	2	3	...	...	828 12 0	4	245 0 0

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT III.—*Suits to which the Municipal Board was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, N.-W. Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1890, and September the 30th, 1891.*

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Municipal Board, Appellant.									Municipal Board, Respondent.								
			Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided.				Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
					For.	Against.	Compromised.	Withdrawn.						For.	Against.	Compromised	Withdrawn.			
	N.-W. PROVINCES.			Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
AGRA ...	Farukhabad ...	Farukhabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	20 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND,	Moradabad ...	Moradabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	4 8 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD,	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	510 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	510 0 0
	OUDH. *Nil.*																			
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	534 8 0	2	...	...	...	...	1	510 0 0

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT IV (No. I).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Municipal Board was realized or remitted during the year* 1890-91, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1891.

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1890.			Awarded to Municipal Board between 1st October 1890 and 30th September 1891.			Total.			Realized during 1890-91.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT,	Dehra Dún ...	Dehra Dún ..	...	...	...	...	...	103 4 0	...	...	103 4 0	...	...	...
	Sahárunpur ...	Sahárunpur ...	...	...	18 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	18 8 0	...	...	18 8 0
	Meerut ...	Gháziabad ...	...	...	...	...	...	11 14 6	...	...	11 14 6	...	...	...
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	...	...	29 12 0	...	2 0 0	23 5 0	...	2 0 0	53 1 0	...	2 0 0	53 1 0
	Farukhabad,	Farukhabad ..	...	...	(a) 19 5 0	...	...	4 0 0	...	...	23 5 0	...	...	6 0 0
	Etah ...	Kásganj ...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	...	...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	...	...
	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri ..	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...
ROHILKHAND.	Moradabad ...	Moradabad ..	4 8 0	1 11 3	9 9 6	...	...	...	4 8 0	1 11 3	9 9 6	...	...	...
	Pilibhít ...	Pilibhít ..	38 0 0	7 9 0	32 3 0	...	4 3 3	...	38 0 0	11 12 3	32 3 0	...	...	...
ALLAHABAD.	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore .	1,109 7 6	...	131 4 10	...	...	25 5 0	1,109 7 6	...	156 9 10	...	...	...
	Fatehpur ...	Fatehpur ..	...	...	...	...	...	14 11 0	...	...	14 11 0	...	...	12 0 0
GORAKHPUR.	Gorakhpur ...	Gorakhpur ...	...	...	(b) 67 8 0	...	...	0 7 0	...	...	67 15 0	...	...	10 5 0
BENARES ...	Benares ...	Benares ...	1,069 0 0	81 3 6	(c) 143 4 0	10 4 0	65 9 11	16 7 0	1,079 4 0	146 13 5	159 11 0	152 4 0	...	13 11 0
	OUDH.													
	Nil.													
	Total, N.-W Provinces ...		2,399 15 6	149 12 9	518 2 4	10 4 0	71 13 2	199 5 6	2,410 3 6	221 9 11	717 7 10	152 4 0	2 0 0	113 9 0

(a) This balance was not shown in the previous year.
(b) Collector says this balance was incorrectly shown at the close of last year.
(c) Incorrectly shown last year.

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT IV (No. II).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Municipal Board was realized or remitted during the year* 1890-91, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1st *of October* 1891—(concluded).

Division.	District.	Municipality.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net Total.			Analysis of balance.		
			Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable.	Doubtful.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT,	Dehra Dún,	Dehra Dún ...	...	...	103 4 0	...	...	...	...	...	103 4 0	103 4 0	...	...
	Meerut ...	Gháziabad ...	...	...	11 14 6	...	...	...	...	...	11 14 6	11 14 6	...	...
AGRA ...	Farukhabad,	Farukhabad...	...	...	17 5 0	...	...	...	...	...	17 5 0	17 5 0	...	...
	Etah ...	Kásganj ...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	...	...	...	179 0 0	59 5 0	66 4 0	304 9 0	...	...
	Mainpuri...	Mainpuri ...	...	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	0 8 0	0 8 0	...	...
ROHIL-KHAND.	Moradabad,	Moradabad ...	4 8 0	1 11 3	9 9 6	...	...	...	4 8 0	1 11 3	9 9 6	15 12 9	...	...
	Pilibhít ...	Pilibhít ...	38 0 0	11 12 3	32 3 0	...	...	...	38 0 0	11 12 3	32 3 0	81 15 3	...	...
ALLAH-ABAD.	Cawnpore...	Cawnpore ...	1,109 7 6	...	156 9 10	...	...	...	1,109 7 6	...	156 9 10	1,266 1 4	...	...
	Fatehpur...	Fatehpur ...	...	...	2 11 0	...	...	2 11 0	...	...	...	...	...	...
GORAKH-PUR.	Gorakhpur,	Gorakhpur ...	...	...	57 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	57 10 0	57 10 0	...	...
BENARES...	Benares ...	Benares ...	927 0 0	146 13 5	146 0 0	...	...	...	927 0 0	146 13 5	146 0 0	1,002 14 8	...	216 14 9
	OUDH.													
	Nil.													
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		2,257 15 6	219 9 11	603 14 10	...	...	2 11 0	2,257 15 6	219 9 11	601 3 10	2,861 14 6	...	216 14 9

APPENDIX B.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the Municipal Board under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1890 and 30th September 1891.*

Division.	District.	Municipality	Nature of disbursements.					Remarks.
			Receipts.	Amount, including costs, awarded against the Municipal Board in regular suits.	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total.	
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
	N.-W. PROVINCES.							
MEERUT ...	Dúhra Dún ...	Dehra Dún ...	*Nil.*	...	...	56 0 0	56 0 0	
	Sahárunpur ...	Sahárunpur ...	18 8 0	38 9 0	...	...	38 9 0	
	Meerut ...	Gházíabad ...	*Nil.*	...	...	20 0 0	20 0 0	
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	Muttra ...	55 1 0	...	...	78 8 6	78 8 6	
	Farukhabad ...	Farukhabad,	6 0 0	...	...	2 2 0	2 2 0	
	Mainpuri ...	Mainpuri ...	*Nil.*	65 2 0	...	46 9 0	111 11 0	
ROHILKHAND ...	Sháhjahánpur ..	Sháhjahánpur,	*Nil.*	...	...	154 12 4	154 12 4	
ALLAHABAD ...	Cawnpore ...	Cawnpore ...	*Nil.*	28 1 0	...	44 15 6	73 0 6	
	Fatehpur ...	Fatehpur ...	12 0 0	...	4 8 0	10 3 0	14 11 0	
GORAKHPUR ...	Gorakhpur ...	Gorakhpur ...	10 3 0	...	...	...	...	
BENARES ...	Benares ...	Benares ...	165 15 0	214 2 9	38 1 6	24 12 0	277 0 3	
	OUDH.							
	Nil.							
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...		267 13 0	345 14 9	42 9 6	437 14 4	826 6 7	

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT I.—*Return of civil suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by Courts of first instance between October the 1st, 1890, and September the 30th, 1891.*

District.	Estate.	Estate, Plaintiff.									Estate, Defendant.								
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of suits pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
Muzaffarnagar	Bhandara	2	303 14 0	...	...	...	1	...	1	40 0 0	1	7,213 8 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bidauli	1	202 10 0	1	...	...	...	202 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Sambalhera	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	12,599 6 5	...	...	...	...	...	2	12,599 6 5
Meerut	Ram Saran Das	1	75 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	75 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Murari Lal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	3,484 10 10	...	...	...	...	...	4	3,484 10 10
Etah	Chet Singh	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	8,562 15 3	...	1	...	...	7,036 9 6	...	...
	Nagla Kisi	4	177 11 9	1	...	...	...	14 6 9	3	163 5 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Etáwah	Harchandpur	1	124 0 3	1	...	...	...	124 0 3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Rosanghpur	2	8,999 5 8	1	...	...	...	(b)7,448 15 9	1	1,550 5 11	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bijnor	Anandi	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,097 14 3	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Sahanpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	200 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Moradabad*	Anand Sarup	2	470 15 6	2	...	...	...	367 11 4	...	...	1	391 12 3	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bareilly	Mashuk Mahal Begam	1	44,974 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	44,974 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sháhjahánpur	Azizganj	2	204 10 0	2	...	...	...	204 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Khamaria	2	6,864 0 4	1	...	...	...	62 11 0	1	6,801 5 4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Khirya	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,500 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Bhatpura	2	3,430 12 7	...	...	...	...	...	2	3,430 12 7	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cawnpore	Misri Lal	1	200 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	200 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Fatehpur	Kasimpur	3	1,140 3 6	3	...	...	...	1,140 3 6	...	...	1	25,347 1 4½	...	1	...	...	25,347 1 4½	...	...
Allahabad	Partab Chand	2	359 10 5	2	...	...	...	359 10 5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Confiscated estates	2	1,743 5 0	2	...	...	...	185 13 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Jaunpur	Bstak Parshad	2	1,600 6 3	...	...	...	...	...	2	1,600 6 3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Azamgarh	Sirai Mir	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	60 0 0	...	...	...	1	...	1	10 0 0
Gházipur	Lachhmi Narayan	2	1,765 10 10	1	...	...	...	277 14 1	1	1,487 12 9	2	No value given.	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Gauri Shankar	1	22,209 10 7	...	...	...	...	...	(a) 1	22,209 10 7	1	522 0 0	...	1	...	...	522 0 0	...	...
Mainpuri	Jasodha Kunwar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	140 0 0	...	...	1	...	...	...	...
Gorakhpur	B. Sikhir Chand	3	24,341 3 0	1	...	...	...	1,193 9 0	2	22,026 13 6	3	22,053 7 6	1	...	...	...	...	2	2,053 7 6
	Majhauli	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	109 12 5	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, N.-W. Provinces	36	1,19,187 1 8	18	...	...	1	11,582 3 1	17	1,04,559 7 11	23	84,282 8 3¼	9	3	1	1	32,905 10 10¼	3	18,147 8 9

	Oudh.																								
Bara Banki ...	Pokhra	2	18,658 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	18,658 2 0	(d)	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Mailarśiganj	9	9,507 11 1	7	1	...	...	3,226 3 11	1	2,555 11 3	4	380 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	2	45 0 0
	Narauli	4	2,945 6 0	2	1	...	...	46 4 0	1	2,889 0 6	9	26,606 9 3	...	...	3	...	...	6	10,355 8 9
	Rámnagar	8	3,655 11 10	6	...	...	...	2,686 15 10	2	968 12 0	10	5,882 10 0	6	2	...	151 11 10	2	5,696 10 0
	Kharka	2	1,566 0 0	...	...	1	...	...	1	1,350 0 0	2	187 0 0	...	...	...	...	2	187 0 0
	Bhilwal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	510 0 0	...	...	...	...	1	510 0 0
	Akhyapur	1	40 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	40 0 0	1	2,000 0 0	...	...	...	...	1	2,000 0 0
	Surajpur	47	56,040 13 6	28	5	1	...	14,355 3 6	13	22,307 7 2	17	60,826 5 2	6	1	1	168 10 0	9	5,578 3 11
	Bhikari Minor ...	1	3,174 9 5	...	...	...	...	...	1	3,174 9 5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hardoi ...	Sarwan	4	81 12 0	...	...	...	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kheri ...	Khairigarh	45	1,02,468 12 10	23	2	...	1	65,802 11 6	19	26,678 1 9	1	646 11 6	...	...	...	...	1	646 11 6
	Kaimahra	2	10,788 13 8	1	...	...	...	8,867 0 11	1	1,921 12 9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Mullanpur	5	10,836 15 6	3	...	...	...	4,593 6 3	2	5,682 5 3	3	58,534 2 3	...	...	...	...	3	58,534 2 3
Sitapur ...	Akharpur	(c) 8	142 5 7	5	2	...	1	142 5 7	...	...	6	2,550 11 1	2	1	1	1,458 5 4	2	854 1 3
	Bahora	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	No value given,	1	...	...	...	...	...
Fyzabad ...	Khapradih	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	1,155 0 0	1	...	...	...	2	1,085 0 0
	Karwar	8	2,409 13 0	3	3	...	...	17 8 0	2	2,025 0 0	1	25 0 0	...	...	1	...	...	...
	Musepur	2	9,996 5 6	...	...	...	...	...	2	9,996 5 6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bahraich ...	Rewa	1	2,165 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,165 0 0	2	28 0 0	2	...	...	...	...	...
Rae Bareli ...	Bhiragobindpur ...	2	30 10 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	30 10 0	1	100 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...
	Pandriganeshpur ...	10	5,737 1 0	9	...	...	...	5,414 1 0	1	23 0 0	2	373 0 0	1	...	1	...	...	...
	Bahua	3	1,152 4 0	2	...	...	...	745 6 0	1	401 6 0	1	767 0 0	...	1	...	767 0 0	...	...
	Binhora	2	9 2 0	2	...	...	...	9 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sultánpur ...	Rámpur	1	127 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	127 8 0	1	1,09,427 1 4	...	...	...	...	1	1,09,427 1 4
	Walipur	1	44 0 0	1	...	...	...	44 0 0	...	...	1	5 0 0	...	1	...	5 0 0	...	...
	Kurwar	14	753 11 7	12	1	...	...	454 5 7	1	250 0 0	8	233 14 0	5	2	...	38 7 0	1	168 15 7
	Mahona	9	14,126 5 0	7	1	1	...	1,985 5 0	...	...	1	22 10 9	1	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	191	2,56,458 13 6	111	16	3	6	1,08,389 15 1	55	1,11,244 11 7	76	2,70,460 11 4	28	8	7	...	2,589 2 2	33	1,95,048 6 7
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh,	227	3,75,645 15 2	129	16	3	7	1,19,972 2 2	72	2,15,804 3 6	99	3,54,743 3 7½	37	11	8	1	35,494 13 0½	42	2,13,195 15 4

* *Vide* note statement No. 17 (I).

(*a*) Pending in Saran district.

(*b*) This value was shown as Rs. 5,485 last year.

(*c*) Three cases were struck off.

(*d*) The suit for Rs. 71-12-0 was decided last year: consequently it is not now carried forward.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT II.—*Return of civil suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by District Courts of Appeal between October the 1st, 1890, and September the 30th, 1891.*

District.	Estate.	Estate, Appellant.									Estate, Respondent.								
		Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.	Number for disposal.	Value of claims.	Decided. For.	Decided. Against.	Decided. Compromised.	Decided. Withdrawn.	Amount decreed.	Number of appeals pending.	Value of claims pending.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.		Rs. a. p.							Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.					Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
Meerut ...	Ram Saran Das ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	142 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	142 8 0
	Murari Lal	1	552 0 6	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	3	715 4 10	...	...	...	...	...	3	715 4 10
Moradabad ...	Mohib Ali Khan ...	1	1,04,000 0 0	...	(a)1	...	...	...	...	...	1	541 0 0	(a)1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Shâhjahânpur ...	Bhatpura	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1,191 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Khirya	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2,500 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Allahabad ...	Confiscated estates ...	1	57 8 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Gorakhpur ...	Majhauli ...	1	10 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	1	10 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, N.-W. Provinces ...	4	1,04,619 8 6	...	3	...	...	...	1	10 0 0	7	5,089 12 10	3	...	...	...	...	4	857 12 10

		OUDH.																					
Bara Banki ...	Rámnagar	...	...		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	50 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	
	Surajpur	2	3,143 9 9	2	...	...	...	3,143 9 9	...	...	3	6,588 5 6	2	...	...	...	...	1	4,914 1 0
Kheri ...	Kaimahra	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	125 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Mullanpur	1	98 7 0	1	...	...	...	98 7 0	...	...	3	5,154 10 3	...	...	...	...	...	3	5,154 10 3
	Khairigarh	2	1,565 12 11	1	...	...	...	267 13 3	1	1,297 15 8		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Fyzabad ...	Musepur	2	5,169 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	2	5,169 2 0	2	11,116 10 6	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Khapradih	(d)1	50 0 0	1	...	...	...	50 0 0	...	...	1	184 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Karwar	(c)1	10 0 0	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	2	106 8 0	1	...	1	...	...	...	...
Bahraich ...	Rewa	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	(b)1	349 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sitapur ...	Akbarpur	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	4,297 10 3	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sultánpur ...	Karwar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5	26 8 0	...	...	...	...	...	5	26 8 0
	Mahona	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	495 0 0	1	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	9	10,036 15 8	5	1	...	...	3,559 14 0	3	6,467 1 8	21	28,493 4 6	11	...	1	...	...	9	10,095 3 3
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh,	13	1,14,656 8 2	5	4	...	...	3,559 14 0	4	6,477 1 8	28	33,583 1 4	14	...	1	...	...	13	10,953 0 1

(a) Both these appeals were decided by the Rámpur Courts.

(b) *Vide* Statement III.

(c) The estate was erroneously shown as defendant last year.

(d) *Vide* Statement III.

APPENDIX C

STATEMENT III—*Suits to which the Court of Wards was a party and which were pending before or finally decided by the Privy Council, High Court, North Western Provinces, and Judicial Commissioner, Oudh, between October the 1st, 1890, and September the 30th, 1891*

District.	Estate	Estate Appellant: Number for disposal	Value of claims	Decided: For	Decided: Against	Decided: Compromised	Decided: Withdrawn	Amount decreed	Number of appeals pending	Value of claims pending	Estate Respondent: Number for disposal	Value of claims	Decided: For	Decided: Against	Decided: Compromised	Decided: Withdrawn	Amount decreed	Number of appeals pending	Value of claims pending	Remarks
	N W PROVINCES		Rs. a. p					Rs a p		Rs a p		Rs a. p					Rs a. p		Rs. a. p.	
Muzaffarnagar,	Sambelhera										1	15 997 4 9						1	15 997 4 9	
Meerut	Murari Lal										2	72 665 8 11						2	72 665 8 11	
Etawah	Harchandpur	(a)1	23,795 14 0						1	23 795 14 0	(a)4	6,502 12 6		1			6 502 12 6			
Cawnpore	Rawatpur										1	3 16 800 0 0			1					
Allahabad	Partab Chand										3	3 690 2 3	2	1			109 8 0			
Moradabad	Mohib Ali Khan										1	5 101 7 6						1	5,101 7 6	Pending before High Court.
Bareilly	Mashuk Mahal Begam	1	25,904 2 3						1	25 904 2 3										
Bijnor	Anandi										1	1 097 14 3						1	1 097 14 3	
Shahjahanpur	Khirya										1	2 500 0 0						1	2 500 0 0	
	Bhatpura										1	1 191 0 0						1	1 191 0 0	
Fatehpur	Kasimpur										(a)*	32 902 0 0						2	32 902 0 0	
Azamgarh	Sarai Mir										1	5 798 0 0					..	1	5 798 0 0	Erroneously shown as decided in the previous year
Ghazipur	Gauri Shankar	(a)*	5,200 0 0						2	5 200 0 0										
Gorakhpur	B Sikhr Chand										1	20 000 0 0						1	20 000 0 0	
	*Majhauli										1	240 0 0		..				1	240 0 0	
	Baungaon										1	28,827 7 2	..					1	28,827 7 2	Pending before the Privy Council
	Total N W Provinces	4	54,900 0 3						4	54,900 0 3	18	5,18 418 9 4	2	2	1		6,662 4 6	13	1,8 370 10 7	
	OUDH																			
Bara Banki*	Malaraigunj	1	3 697 14 11	1				3 697 14 11			1	6,668 0 0		..				†1	6,668 0 0	†Pending before the Privy Council
	Ramnagar	2	14 078 9 0		1				†1	11 198 9 0	1	510 0 0						1	510 0 0	
	Suragpur																			
Bahraich	Rewa										1	No value given			..			1	No value given	Application under section 622 Civil Procedure Code erroneously shown in Statement II last year
Fyzabad	Khapradih	(a)1	31 0 0		1															
Sultanpur	Karwar	1	16 8 0						1	16 8 0										
	Mohona	3	17 474 0 0		1				2	18 974 0 0	1	354 0 0						1	354 0 0	
	Total Oudh	8	30 297 10 11	1	3			3 697 14 11	4	30 199 1 0	4	7 532 0 0						4	7 532 0 0	
	Total N W P & Oudh	12	90,198 0 2	1	3			3,697 14 11	8	80,089 1 7	22	5 20 950 9 4	2	2	1	..	6,662 4 6	17	1 93 902 10 7	

* The appeal shown pending against Pokhra estate last year was erroneously entered as such, it being decided

(a) These appeals were wrongly shown in Statement II last year

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT IV. (No. I.)—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1890-91, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October* 1891.

District.	Estate.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1890.			Awarded to Court of Wards between 1st October 1890 and 30th September 1891.			Total.			Realized during 1890-91.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Muzaffarnagar.	Bidauli ...	...	...	202 10 0	...	...	4 0 0	...	...	206 10 0	...	...	206 10 0
	Bhandara ...	350 0 0	(a)117 5 0	676 15 0	...	...	157 9 0	350 0 0	117 5 0	834 8 0	...	...	...
Meerut ...	Ram Saran Das ...	104 12 0	40 11 0	14 6 0	...	8 9 0	11 8 0	104 12 0	49 4 0	25 14 0	...	...	...
	Murari Lal ...	6,076 12 11	346 6 9	457 15 11	...	286 1 2	310 14 4	6,076 12 11	632 7 11	768 14 3	1,504 15 0	488 0 8	687 9 0
Muttra ...	Parshadi Lal ...	82 0 0	...	15 15 10	...	3 10 6	10 5 0	82 0 0	3 10 6	26 4 10	36 0 0	0 15 6	7 7 10
Etah ...	Nagal Kisi ...	231 8 9	20 14 2	27 1 0	16 7 3	10 1 2	12 0 0	248 0 0	30 15 4	39 1 0	...	...	4 3 6
	Nagla Anni ...	9 0 0	(e)0 6 0	(e)7 2 0	...	1 10 3	2 4 0	9 0 0	2 0 3	9 6 0	...	...	...
Etáwah ...	Harchandpur ...	...	...	...	124 0 3	0 15 0	25 7 8	124 0 3	0 15 0	25 7 8	124 0 3	0 15 0	25 7 8
	Rosanghpur ...	...	...	...	736 10 11	103 15 0	709 12 0	736 10 11	103 15 0	709 12 0	...	...	...
Mainpuri...	Arjunpur ...	688 0 9	198 6 0	149 11 0	...	...	...	688 0 9	198 6 0	149 11 0	65 0 0	5 0 0	5 0 0
	Sujrai ...	...	...	745 9 3	...	...	...	...	...	745 9 3	...	...	...
Bijnor ...	Sahanpur ...	1,082 7 11	93 11 8	154 9 3	...	59 13 6	51 15 2	1,082 7 11	153 9 2	206 8 5	932 5 8	145 7 10	146 2 6
	Anandi ...	...	...	...	...	...	229 2 4	...	...	229 2 4	...	...	...
Moradabad.*	Mohib Ali Khan...	...	...	272 2 0	...	...	...	...	...	272 2 0	...	...	272 2 0
	Anand Sarup ...	...	...	...	367 11 4	37 0 9	80 3 1	367 11 4	37 0 9	80 3 1	...	...	21 9 6
Bareilly ...	Mashuk Mahal Begam.	2,017 6 0	89 9 0	(i)308 15 0	...	30 15 6	9 2 0	2,017 6 0	120 8 6	318 1 0	200 0 0	120 8 6	283 15 6
Shahjahánpur.	Azizganj ...	827 6 0	29 11 0	(c)87 6 8	204 10 0	20 6 9	36 14 3	1,032 0 0	50 1 9	124 4 11	100 0 6	11 2 3	36 14 3
	Bhatpura ...	(d)354 11 5	(d)48 0 0	(d)118 12 0	...	2 8 0	60 11 9	354 11 5	50 8 0	179 7 9	152 9 6	9 8 0	147 5 9
	Bamrauli ...	14 0 0	...	28 9 6	...	...	...	14 0 0	...	28 9 6	14 0 0	...	25 14 6
	Khamaria ...	...	...	...	62 11 0	22 5 0	15 5 0	62 11 0	22 5 0	15 5 0	...	...	...
	Khirya ...	...	...	...	...	...	90 1 4	...	...	90 1 4	...	...	...
Fatehpur ...	Kasimpur ...	...	...	1,133 0 6	...	17 3 0	5 2 0	...	17 3 0	1,138 2 6	...	17 3 0	1,138 2 6
Allahabad,	Partab Chand ...	(g)15,964 11 4	1,559 10 8	2,489 14 6	468 15 11½	564 3 8	248 3 4	16,433 11 3½	2,123 14 4	2,738 1 10	5,807 10 0	979 8 8	936 10 10
	Confiscated estates.	...	...	41 2 0	143 5 0	...	268 7 4	143 5 0	...	309 9 4	116 8 7	...	221 9 11
Jaunpur ...	Batak Parshad	750 0 0	(h)642 12 1	202 8 0	...	68 14 4	169 12 0	750 0 0	711 10 5	372 4 0	...	...	72 12 6
Azamgarh	Sarai Mir ...	...	...	(f)21 3 0	...	...	...	...	...	21 3 0	...	...	...
Gházipur...	Lachmi Narayan,	1,104 7 0	798 4 11	56 3 0	...	120 7 4	102 1 6	1,104 7 0	918 12 3	158 4 6	...	400 0 0	...
	Gauri Shankar ...	15,175 9 11	5,362 14 3	2,714 14 8	...	1,673 0 6	314 3 6	15,175 9 11	7,035 14 9	3,029 2 2	...	2,255 0 0	...
Gorakhpur,	Narharpur ...	...	...	20 1 0	...	...	...	...	...	20 1 0	...	...	20 1 0
	Dumri ...	(b)...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	B. Sikhir Chand,	...	17 10 9	393 6 0	1,193 9 0	47 7 8	642 0 0	1,193 9 0	65 2 5	1,035 6 0	...	32 11 6	393 6 0
	Majbauli ...	2,287 5 4	395 2 1	141 1 8½	...	137 12 10	142 10 6½	2,287 5 4	532 14 11	283 12 3	...	...	191 11 10
	Total, N.-W. P. ...	47,120 3 4	9,761 7 4	10,471 2 9½	3,317 6. 8½	3,217 0 11	3,699 11 1½	50,437 10 0½	12,978 8 3	14,170 13 11	9,053 1 6	4,466 0 11	4,844 12 1

* Kunj Behari Lal estate is no longer under Court of Wards' management.

(*a*) Incorrectly shown as Rs. 116-6-10 in the previous year.

(*b*) No outstanding balance in previous year. Rs. 82 was incorrectly shown.

(*c*) Collector says Rs. 18-0-6 having been realized are not shown.

(*d*) The balances of last year did not include outstandings in execution of decree suits. These are now included.

(*e*) These balances were not shown in the previous year.

(*f*) Omitted from last year's report.

(*g*) Collector says Rs. 333-14-6 was erroneously included last year.

(*h*) Incorrectly shown last year.

(*i*) This balance was wrongly shown last year.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT IV (No. I).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1890-91, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October* 1891.

District.	Estate.	Sums outstanding on the 1st October 1890.			Awarded to Court of Wards between 1st October 1890 and 30th September 1891.			Total.			Realized during 1890-91.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.
	OUDH.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.
Bara Banki,	Pokhra ...	28 8 0	...	2,182 3 0	...	...	...	28 8 0	...	2,182 3 0	2 11 0	...	1,010 5 6
	Mallaraiganj ...	1,498 7 10	...	(c)6,702 6 0	735 12 5	...	206 15 11	2,234 4 3	...	6,909 5 11	1,268 0 3	...	4,256 14 5
	Naraili ...	...	...	3,156 5 0	21 4 0	...	12 7 0	21 4 0	...	3,168 12 0	7 4 6	...	3,168 12 0
	Ramnagar ...	...	...	...	1,197 6 5	102 14 0	240 12 6	1,197 6 5	102 14 0	240 12 6	28 6 5	...	46 6 0
	Surajpur ...	385 12 0	...	192 15 6	13,482 0 6	...	2,222 14 11	13,867 12 6	...	2,415 14 5	162 2 0	...	258 5 6
	Bhikari Minor ...	2,874 8 5	92 7 0	206 12 0	...	...	...	2,874 8 5	92 7 0	206 12 0	...	...	...
Khérí ...	Khairigarh ...	4,700 0 0	2,928 12 10	901 10 0	13,265 14 9	9,168 15 10	2,727 2 9	17,965 14 9	12,097 12 8	3,628 12 9	4,121 9 0	2,496 8 6	885 13 9
	Mallanpur ...	...	...	...	...	...	779 15 9	...	...	779 15 9	...	...	...
	Kaimahra ...	...	...	...	...	...	6 12 0	...	...	6 12 0	...	...	6 12 0
Sitapur, ...	Akbarpur ...	(a) 354 9 2	...	22 5 0	...	...	21 12 0	354 9 2	...	44 1 0	57 6 11	...	27 1 3
	Bahora ...	(a)	...	2 0 0	...	...	274 6 0	...	...	276 6 0	...	...	2 0 0
Fyzabad .	Musepur ...	...	...	373 9 0	...	...	120 6 0	...	...	493 15 0	...	...	387 8 0
	Khapradih ...	824 13 7	(b)19 4 2	1,025 10 0	...	27 12 0	166 6 0	824 13 7	47 0 2	1,192 0 0	824 13 7	47 0 2	359 13 10
	Karwar ...	200 0 0	...	2 10 0	14 0 0	...	65 3 0	214 0 0	...	67 13 0	...	...	0 5 0
Bahraich ...	Bawa ...	47 3 3	18 12 11	1,027 2 7	136 2 3	36 3 4	88 4 4	183 5 6	55 0 3	1,115 6 11	27 4 0	20 10 3	159 8 2
Rae Bareli,	Bhiragobindpur ...	95 10 6	...	9 1 0	...	...	1 4 0	95 10 6	...	10 5 0	...	...	9 13 0
	Pandri Ganeshpur,	2,430 9 9	6 15 0	269 15 6	106 8 0	2 2 2	208 14 0	2,537 1 9	9 1 2	418 13 6	61 14 1	6 15 0	154 2 0
	Bahna ...	73 12 0	...	122 11 9	347 0 0	...	57 3 0	420 12 0	...	179 14 9	8 7 0	...	10 0 0
	Binhora ...	...	...	2 0 0	3 0 0	...	4 3 0	3 0 0	...	6 3 0	...	...	...
Sultánpur,*	Mahona ...	137 8 8	12 10 0	1,255 5 9	...	123 4 9	183 14 0	137 8 3	135 14 9	1,439 3 9	53 14 9	...	200 6 9
	Walipur ...	235 14 0	...	82 1 9	...	...	...	235 14 0	...	82 1 9	...	...	2 0 0
	Karwar ...	72 0 0	15 5 6	195 0 0	9 0 7	...	61 14 0	81 0 7	15 5 6	256 14 0	...	...	19 10 3
Partábgarh,	Bargaon ...	64 8 0	...	1,472 0 9	...	...	0 6 0	64 8 0	...	1,472 6 9	...	...	...
	Total, Oudh, ...	14,023 12 9	3,094 3 5	19,143 12 7	29,318 0 11	9,461 4 1	7,451 0 2	43,341 13 8	12,555 7 6	26,594 12 9	6,623 13 6	2,571 1 11	10,965 8 5
	Total, N.-W. P. and Oudh.	61,144 0 1	12,856 10 9	29,614 15 4½	32,635 7 7½	12,678 5 0	11,150 11 3½	93,779 7 8½	25,533 15 9	40,765 10 8	15,676 15 0	7,037 2 10	15,810 4 6

Nanemao and Unchgaon estates are no longer under Court of Wards management.

(a) Deputy Commissioner says abond has been executed for the difference.

(b) Was not shown in the previous year.

(c) Incorrectly shown in the previous year.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT IV (No II) —*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1890-91, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October* 1891—(continued).

District	Estate	Balance			Remitted			Net Total			Analysis of Balance		
		Principal	Interest	Costs.	Principal	Interest.	Costs	Principal	Interest	Costs	Recoverable	Irrecoverable	Doubtful
	N W PROVINCES	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p
Muzaffarnagar,	Bhandara	350 0 0	117 5 0	834 8 0	150 0 0	53 7 0	676 15 0	200 0 0	63 14 0	157 9 0	421 7 0	...	...
Meerut	Ram Saran Das	104 12 0	49 4 0	25 14 0	.		..	104 12 0	49 4 0	25 14 0	179 14 0		
	Murari Lal	4,571 13 11	144 7 3	81 5 3			...	4,571 13 11	144 7 3	81 5 3	4,554 14 2	242 12 3	
Muttra	Parbhadi Lal	46 0 0	2 11 0	18 13 0		.	...	46 0 0	2 11 0	18 13 0	67 8 0		
Etah	Nagla Kisu	248 0 0	30 15 4	34 13 6		.	...	248 0 0	30 15 4	34 13 6	172 11 6	141 1 4	
	Nagla Abnt	9 0 0	2 0 3	9 6 0		.	..	9 0 0	2 0 3	9 6 0	20 6 3	.	.
Etawah	Roshangpur	736 10 11	103 15 0	709 12 0			..	736 10 11	103 15 0	709 12 0	1,550 5 11	.	...
Mainpuri	Arjunpur	623 0 9	193 6 0	144 11 0		...		623 0 9	193 6 0	144 11 0	961 1 9	...	..
	Sujrai			745 9 3		.	..			745 9 3	745 9 3	.	..
Bijnor	Sahanpur	150 2 3	8 1 4	60 5 11	.	.	...	150 2 3	8 1 4	60 5 11	155 1 6	63 8 0	...
	Anpadi			229 2 4	.	..		.		229 2 4	229 2 4		...
Moradabad	Anand Sarup	367 11 4	37 0 9	58 10 1	...	.	.	367 11 4	37 0 9	58 10 1	463 6 2		..
Bareilly	Mashuk Mahal Begam.	1,817 6 0	.	34 1 6	...	..	...	1,817 6 0	..	34 1 6	1,851 7 6		...
Shahjahanpur,	Aunganj	931 15 6	38 15 6	87 6 8	...	..	...	931 15 6	38 15 6	87 6 8	1,018 1 5	(a) 40 4 3	...
	Bhatpura	202 1 11	41 0 0	32 2 0	...		...	202 1 11	41 0 0	32 2 0	275 3 11	.	..
	Bumraoli			2 11 0	.	...	...			2 11 0	..		...
	Khamaria	62 11 0	22 5 0	15 5 0			...	62 11 0	22 5 0	15 5 0	100 5 0	.	
	Khirya			90 1 4	.	...	...	..		90 1 4	90 1 4		..
Allahabad	Partab Chand	10,626 1 3¼	1,144 5 8	1,801 7 0	...	...	.	10,626 1 3¼	1,144 5 8	1,801 7 0	10,013 4 7¼	3,292 8 2	266 1 3
	Confiscated estates	26 12 5	..	87 15 5	...	...	..	26 12 5	.	87 15 5	9 14 6	99 12 10	5 0 6
Jaunpur	Batak Parshad	750 0 0	711 10 5	299 7 6	.	...		750 0 0	711 10 5	299 7 6	1,761 1 11		..
Azamgarh	Barai Mir	..	.	21 3 0	...	..	...		..	21 3 0	21 3 0	...	..
Ghazipur	Lachmi Narayan	1,104 7 0	518 12 3	158 4 6	...	...	...	1,104 7 0	518 12 3	158 4 6	1,781 7 9	...	.
	Gauri Shankar	15,175 9 11	4,780 14 9	3,029 2 2	...	..	...	15,175 9 11	4,780 14 9	3,029 2 2	22,985 10 10	...	.
Gorakhpur	B Sukhir Chand	1 193 9 0	32 6 11	642 0 0	...	..	...	1,193 9 0	32 6 11	642 0 0	1,867 15 11	...	...
	Majhauli	2,287 5 4	532 14 11	92 0 5	...	...	...	2,287 5 4	532 14 11	92 0 5	2,912 4 8	...	..
	Total, N W P ...	41,384 8 6¼	8,512 7 4	9,326 1 10	150 0 0	53 7 0	676 15 0	41,234 8 6¼	8,459 0 4	8,649 2 10	54,191 9 2¼	3,879 14 10	271 1 8

(a) This amount was remitted after the year closed.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT IV (No. II).—*Return showing what portion of the amounts decreed in favour of the Court of Wards was realized or remitted during the year* 1890-91, *and also the sums outstanding on the* 1*st of October* 1891—(concluded).

District	Estate.	Balance.			Remitted.			Net Total.			Analysis of Balance.		
		Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Principal.	Interest.	Costs.	Recoverable.	Irrecoverable	Doubtful.
	OUDH.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p
Bara Banki ...	Pokhra ...	25 13 0	...	1,171 14 0	...	...	3 12 0	25 13 0	...	1,168 2 0	1,193 15 0	...	...
	Mailaraiganj ...	966 4 0	...	2,652 7 6	966 4 0	...	96 12 3	...	...	2,555 11 3	2,555 11 3	...	...
	Naraulí ...	13 15 6	...	...	...	...	...	13 15 6	...	...	13 15 6	...	...
	Ramnagar ...	1,169 0 0	102 14 0	194 6 6	...	...	...	1,169 0 0	102 14 0	194 6 6	45 0 6	...	1,421 4 0
	Suraipur ...	13,705 10 6	...	2,157 9 5	...	...	...	13,705 10 6	...	2,157 9 5	15,788 11 11	74 8 0*	...
	Bhikari Minor ..	2,874 8 5	92 7 0	206 12 0	...	...	...	2,874 8 5	92 7 0	206 12 0	3,173 11 5	...	...
Kheri ...	Khairigarh ...	13,844 5 9	9,601 4 2	2,742 15 0	...	...	...	13,844 5 9	9,601 4 2	2,742 15 0	26,188 8 11	...	...
	Mullanpur ...	...	...	779 15 9	...	...	...	...	...	779 15 9	779 15 9	...	...
Sitapur ..	Akharpur ...	297 2 3	...	16 15 9	58 8 0	...	4 4 9	238 10 3	...	12 11 0	251 5 3	...	...
	Bahora ...	...	...	274 6 0	...	...	...	...	...	274 6 0	274 6 0	...	...
Fyzabad ...	Musepur ...	...	...	106 7 0	...	...	...	...	...	106 7 0	106 7 0	...	...
	Khapradih ...	...	...	832 2 2	...	...	35 4 2	...	...	796 14 0	796 14 0	...	...
	Karwar ...	214 0 0	...	67 8 0	...	...	...	214 0 0	...	67 8 0	281 8 0	...	...
Bahraich ...	Rewa ...	156 1 6	34 6 0	955 14 9	...	...	...	156 1 6	34 6 0	955 14 9	1,146 6 3	...	...
Rae Bareli ...	Bhirgobindpur ..	95 10 6	...	0 8 0	...	...	...	95 10 6	...	0 8 0	96 2 6	...	...
	Pandriganeshpur ...	2,475 3 8	2 2 2	264 11 6	...	...	...	2,475 3 8	2 2 2	264 11 6	176 6 2	2,565 11 2	...
	Ralua ...	412 5 0	...	169 14 9	...	...	...	412 5 0	...	169 14 9	582 3 9	...	...
	Bhulora ...	3 0 0	...	6 3 0	...	...	...	3 0 0	...	6 3 0	9 3 0	...	...
Sultánpur ...	Mahona ...	83 9 6	135 14 9	1,238 13 0	...	...	...	83 9 6	135 14 9	1,238 13 0	1,453 1 0	5 4 3	...
	Walipur ...	235 14 0	...	80 1 9	...	...	...	235 14 0	...	80 1 9	11 11 6	304 4 3	...
	Karwar ...	81 0 7	15 5 6	237 3 9	...	...	...	81 0 7	15 5 6	237 3 9	333 9 10	...	...
Partábgarh ...	Bargaon ...	64 8 0	...	1,472 6 9	...	...	1,458 2 3	64 8 0	...	14 4 6	78 12 6	...	...
	Total, Oudh ...	36,718 0 2	9,984 5 7	15,629 4 4	1,024 12 0	...	1,598 3 5	35,693 4 2	9,984 5 7	14,031 0 11	55,337 11 0	2,949 11 8	1,421 4 0
		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total, N.-W. P & O,	78,102 8 8½	18,496 12 11	24,955 6 2	1,174 12 0	53 7 0	2,275 2 5	76,927 12 8½	18,443 5 11	22,680 3 9	1,09,529 4 2½	6,829 10 6	1,692 5 8
		...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the Court of Wards under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1890 and 30th September 1891.*

District.	Estate.	Receipts.	Nature of disbursements.				Remarks.
			Amount, including costs, awarded against the Court of Wards in regular suits	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total.	
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
Muzaffarnagar ...	Sambalhera	...	...	...	2 0 0	2 0 0	
	Bidauli	206 10 0	...	4 0 0	...	4 0 0	
	Bhaudara	...	...	30 1 0	127 3 0	157 4 0	
Meerut ...	Ram Saran Das ...	...	11 8 0	10 8 0	0 8 0	22 8 0	
	Murari Lal	2,680 8 8	1,026 2 9	1 8 0	83 0 0	1,110 10 9	
Muttra ...	Parshadi Lal	44 7 4	27 12 2	...	...	27 12 2	
Etah ...	Nagla Kisi	4 3 6	...	6 6 0	...	6 6 0	
	Chet Singh	...	...	...	327 8 0	327 8 0	
Etáwah ...	Harchandpur ...	150 6 11	3,088 15 0	49 5 6	24 3 6	3,162 8 0	
	Roshangpur	..	...	380 0 0	...	380 0 0	
Mainpuri ...	Arjunpur	75 0 0	...	...	...	...	
	Jasoda Kunwar ...	...	115 0 0	...	10 0 0	125 0 0	
Bijnor ...	Sahanpur	1,224 0 0	...	...	106 2 0	106 2 0	
	Khiratpur	...	...	27 9 0	...	27 9 0	
Moradabad ...	Mohib Ali Khan ...	272 2 0	...	5,200 0 0	370 6 0	5,570 6 0	
	Anand Sarup ...	21 9 0	...	32 3 4	25 13 0	58 0 4	
Bareilly ...	Mashuk Mahal Begum ...	604 8 0	1,118 1 0	274 9 3	...	1,387 10 3	
Shahjahánpur ...	Azizganj	148 1 0	...	10 4 3	...	10 4 3	
	Ilhatpura	309 7 3	...	262 7 9	...	262 7 9	
	Bamroli	39 14 6	...	...	...	...	
	Khamaria	...	...	40 1 0	...	40 1 0	
	Khirya	...	...	...	129 1 0	129 1 0	
Fatehpur ...	Kasimpur	(a) 1,176 6 6	174 10 0	5 2 0	1,265 5 1	1,445 1 1	
Allahabad ...	Partab Chand ...	7,723 13 6	661 9 4	57 0 3	71 0 3	789 9 10	
	Confiscated estates ...	(b) 327 1 6	43 11 0	225 13 2	...	269 8 2	
Cawnpore ...	Rawatpur	...	...	...	1,032 6 6	1,032 6 6	
	Misri Lal	...	...	20 0 0	...	20 0 0	
Jaunpur ...	Ilatak Parshad ...	72 12 6	...	10 8 0	...	10 8 0	
Gházipur ...	Lachmi Narayan ...	400 0 0	...	57 11 9	48 9 6	106 5 3	
	Gauri Shankar ...	2,255 0 0	636 6 0	384 3 3	28 10 9	1,049 4 0	
Gorakhpur ...	Narharpur	20 1 0	...	...	...	...	
	Banagaon	..	...	...	13 4 3	13 4 3	
	B. Sikhar Chand ...	426 1 6	...	1,315 0 0	1,343 14 6	2,658 14 6	
	Majhauli	191 11 10	...	29 15 0	15 0 0	44 15 0	
	Choumukha	...	...	...	9 9 6	9 9 6	
	Total, N.-W. P. ...	18,373 14 6	6,898 11 3	8,448 4 6	5,033 8 10	20,375 8 7	

(a) This amount includes Rs 21-1-0 refunded by Government Pleader and not shown in Statement IV (No. 1).

(b) Does not include Rs. 11-1-0 which were set off against the costs due to the opposite party.

APPENDIX C.

STATEMENT V.—*Showing the amount expended on litigation as contrasted with sums actually realized by the Court of Wards under decrees of the Court between 1st October 1890 and 30th September 1891*—(concluded).

District.	Estate.	Receipts.	Nature of disbursements: Amount, including costs, awarded against the Court of Wards in regular suits.	In prosecution.	In defence.	Total	Remarks.
	OUDH.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	
Bara Banki ...	Pokhra	1,018 0 0	...	684 13 9	...	684 13 9	
	Mailaraiganj... ...	5,524 14 8	...	204 5 0	95 8 0	299 13 0	
	Narauli	3,176 0 6	...	243 6 9	44 2 0	287 8 9	
	Bhilwal	...	...	...	1 0 0	1 0 0	
	Rámnagar	74 12 5	...	156 15 0	586 2 0	743 1 0	
	Surajpur	420 7 0	...	1,248 8 1	548 6 0	1,796 14 1	
	Akhyapur	...	...	1 12 0	...	1 12 0	
	Kharka	...	...	7 10 6	22 11 3	30 5 9	
	Bikhari Minor ..	...	...	203 13 2	...	203 13 2	
Hardoi ...	Sarwan	...	...	10 6 0	...	10 6 0	
Kheri ...	Khairigarh	7,503 15 3	...	3,567 11 0	72 0 6	3,639 11 6	
	Mullanpur	...	...	388 6 3	183 13 9	572 4 0	
	Kaimshra	6 12 0	...	387 2 0	8 5 0	395 7 0	
Sitapur ...	Akbarpur	84 8 2	3,234 4 9	12 5 9	11 2 3	3,307 12 9	
	Bahora	2 0 0	...	...	278 10 6	278 10 6	
Fyzabad ...	Musepur	387 8 0	448 4 0	...	...	448 4 0	
	Khapradih	1,231 11 7	1,007 2 0	...	...	1,007 2 0	
	Kurwar	0 5 0	168 1 3	...	...	168 1 3	
Bahraich ...	Rewa	(a) 213 11 5	...	96 11 0	41 10 0	138 5 0	
Rae Bareli ...	Bhiragobindpur .	9 13 0	...	4 14 3	1 5 6	6 3 9	
	Pandriganeshpur ...	222 15 1	...	263 12 0	21 4 3	285 0 3	
	Babna	18 7 0	...	28 7 0	1 0 0	29 7 0	
	Binhora	...	18 8 0	3 13 0	...	22 5 9	
Sultánpur ...	Mahona	254 5 6	683 9 0	1,280 4 0	28 9 6	2,001 6 6	
	Walipur	2 0 0	...	2 3 2	1 8 0	3 11 2	
	Karwar	19 10 3	10 13 0	42 8 0	17 1 0	70 0 0	
	Rámpur	...	..	24 13 0	614 0 0	638 13 0	
	Total, Oudh ...	20,166 12 10	5,620 10 0	8,873 9 5	2,578 3 6	17,072 6 11	
	Total, N.-W. P and Oudh...	38,540 11 4	12,519 5 3	17,316 13 11	7,611 12 4	37,447 15 6	

(a) Includes Rs. 6-5-0 recovered without execution of decree and not shown in statement IV (No. 1).

APPENDIX D.

Classification of suits instituted by State, Municipal Boards, and Courts of Wards during the year ending 30th September 1891.

	Total.	Decisions.								Pending.
		Number.	Favourable.	Number.	Unfavourable.	Number.	Compromised, withdrawn, or remanded.	Number.		
	Class I.—Suits arising out of relations created by contracts.									
			Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.			Rs. a. p.
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	5	4	281 15 3	...	...	1	140 0 0	...		...
Total ...	5	4	281 15 3	...	...	1	140 0 0	...		...
	Class I (a).—To recover money or property due under a contract.									
High Court	1	...	...	1	1,968 13 0	...	...	...		...
District Courts of appeal ...	16	13	12,019 15 1	1	1,04,000 0 0	...	...	2		6,212 0 8
Original suits	117	61	79,679 8 3	13	15,114 4 5	7	16,084 4 0	36		1,53,482 10 1
Total ...	134	74	91,699 7 4	15	1,21,083 1 5	7	16,084 4 0	38		1,59,694 10 9
	Class I (b).—For damages arising from breach of contract.									
High Court	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1		5,151 7 6
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	5	2	113 4 11	...	...	...	...	3		646 7 7
Total ...	6	2	113 4 11	...	...	...	...	4		5,797 15 1
	Class I (c).—To enforce specific performance of contract.									
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	1	...	...	.	...	...	. .	1		44,974 0 0
Total ...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1		44,974 0 0
	Class II.—To recover damages on account of torts.									
High Court	3	.	...	...	...	...	...	3		8,408 0 0
District Courts of appeal ...	1	1	1,500 0 0	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	15	2	23 8 0	3	287 4 11	2	700 0 0	8		1,048 4 10
Total ...	19	3	1,523 8 0	3	287 4 11	2	700 0 0	11		9,456 4 10
	Class III.—For redemption or foreclosure of property.									
High Court	2	1	6,552 13 6	...	...	...	...	1		185 4 0
District Courts of appeal ...	1	1	1,487 8 6	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	2	1	7,448 15 9	...	...	...	...	1		510 0 0
Total ...	5	3	15,489 5 9	...	...	...	...	2		695 4 0
	Class IV.—For declaration of right to, or for possession of, real property.									
High Court	24	2	1,083 8 0	3	6,711 0 0	1	3,16,800 0 0	18		1,23 092 13 5
District Courts of appeal ...	34	13	15,023 2 6	6	938 11 0	1	103 0 0	14		10,855 4 2
Original suits	114	55	6,39,700 13 11	13	2,000 4 0	4	1,137 0 0	42		2,54,587 4 1
Total ...	172	70	6,55,757 8 5	22	9,640 15 0	6	3,18,040 0 0	74		3,87,534 5 9
	Class V.—Suits under the Land Rent Acts.									
High Court	1	1	4 8 0	...	...	...	...	...		...
District Courts of appeal ...	5	1	560 0 0	1	552 0 6	...	...	3		715 4 10
Original suits	10	4	877 2 8	...	...	1	49 0 0	5		1,607 0 10
Total ...	16	6	1,441 10 8	1	552 0 6	1	49 0 0	8		2,322 5 8

APPENDIX D.

Classification of suits instituted by State, Municipal Boards, and Courts of Wards during the year ending 30th September 1891—(concluded).

	Total.	Decisions.								Pending.
		Number.	Favourable.	Number.	Unfavourable.	Number.	Compromised, withdrawn, or remanded.	Number.		
			Class VI.—To declare a personal right.							
			Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.			Rs. a. p.
High Court	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1		510 0 0
District Courts of appeal ...	2	1	100 0 0	1	78 12 0	..	...	...		...
Original suits	9	2	240 5 0	...	...	4	81 12 0	3		3,805 0 0
Total ...	12	3	340 5 0	1	78 12 0	4	81 12 0	4		4 315 0 0
			Class VII.—To set aside sales by, or orders of, a Civil Court.							
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
District Courts of appeal ...	2	...	...	...	...	..	...	2		112 0 0
Original suits	3	1	275 0 0	1	25,347 1 4½	...	...	1		5,821 8 3
Total ...	5	1	275 0 0	1	25,347 1 4½	...	...	3		5,933 8 3
			Class VIII.—To aside acts or orders passed by officers of Government							
High Court	1	1	150 0 0	...	...	...	...	..		...
District Courts of appeal ...	4	...	...	1	2,920 12 0	...	...	3		115 0 0
Original suits	7	2	40 0 0	3	3,540 12 0	2	4,000 0 0	...		...
Total ...	12	3	190 0 0	4	6,461 8 0	2	4,000 0 0	3		115 0 0
			Class IX.—Compensation for land acquired for public purposes.							
High Court	3	1	10,500 0 0	1	172 9 4	...	...	1		No value given.
District Courts of appeal ...	1	1	148 0 0	...	...	...	...	...		
Original suits	45	20	7,781 1 5	14	17,968 3 9	7	7,239 15 3	4		9,944 9 8
Total ...	49	22	18,429 1 5	15	18,140 13 1	7	7,239 15 3	5		9,944 9 8
			Class X.—Application for the execution of decrees.							
High Court	1	1	3,607 14 11	...	...	..	...	...		...
District Courts of appeal ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...			...
Original suits	116	56	53,475 6 10	12	5,613 6 6	3	1,501 0 9	45		91,645 0 9
Total ...	117	57	57,173 5 9	12	5,613 6 6	3	1,501 0 9	45		91,645 9 9
			Class XI.—Suits under Acts XL of 1858, XXVII of 1860, &c.							
High Court	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1		No value given.
District Courts of appeal ...	2	...	...	1	4 0 0	...	...	1		123 0 0
Original suits	20	14	9,667 10 8	4	2,105 0 0	1	No value given.	1		1,849 11 9
Total ...	23	14	9,667 10 8	5	2,109 0 0	1	No value given.	3		1,972 11 9
			Class XII.—References under Act X of 1870, Parts III and IV.							
High Court	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
District Courts of appeal ...	...	.	...	...	...	...	...	...		...
Original suits	5	5	360 11 0	...	...	...	...	...		...
Total ...	5	5	360 11 0	...	...	...	...	..		...
			Class XIII.—Miscellaneous.							
High Court	4	...	...	1	371 0 0	...	...	3		1,05,507 8 11
District Courts of appeal ...	..	...	...	...	..	...	...	...		..
Original suits	17	6	451 0 8	4	8,163 11 8	2	147 11 6	5		6,151 3 0
Total ...	21	6	451 0 8	5	8,534 11 8	2	147 11 6	8		1,11,718 11 11
GRAND TOTAL ...	602	273	8,53,193 14 10	84	1,97,857 10 5½	36	1,48,983 11 6	209		8,36,920 1 5

APPENDIX E.

Statement showing progress made during the year ending 30th September 1891 in realizing Government dues in pauper suits in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh.

Division.	District.	Outstanding on 1st October 1890.	Dues for the year under report.	Total.	Recovered.	Expunged.	Total.	Balance on the 30th September 1891.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	N.-W. PROVINCES.	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs a. p	Rs. a. p	Rs. a. p.
MEERUT,	Sahárunpur ...	(a) 844 3 0	126 0 0	970 9 0	72 5 0	429 7 0	501 12 0	468 13 0
	Muzaffarnagar ...	55 0 0	207 11 0	292 11 0	68 12 0	167 7 0	236 3 0	56 8 0
	Meerut ...	(f) 669 2 0	261 5 0	930 7 0	*Nil.*	372 10 0	372 10 0	557 13 0
	Bulandshahr ...	(b) 30 0 0	*Nil.*	30 0 0	*Nil.*	30 0 0	30 0 0	*Nil.*
	Aligarh ..	305 8 0	845 12 0	1,151 4 0	*Nil.*	*Nil.*	*Nil.*	1,151 4 0
	Total ...	1,933 13 0	1,441 2 0	3,374 15 0	141 1 0	999 8 0	1,140 9 0	2,234 6 0
AGRA ...	Muttra ...	179 10 0	1,195 8 0	1,375 2 0	85 14 0	155 8 0	241 6 0	1,133 12 0
	Agra ...	(c) 3,460 5 0	4,190 4 0	7,959 9 0	1,450 8 0	1,531 3 0	2,981 11 0	4 977 14 0
	Farukhabad ...	480 14 0	204 8 0	685 6 0	9 10 0	204 0 0	213 10 0	471 12 0
	Etah ...	279 15 9	1,049 8 0	1,329 7 9	*Nil.*	241 4 0	241 4 0	1,088 3 9
	Mainpuri ...	996 6 0	92 0 0	1,088 6 0	914 9 0	*Nil.*	914 9 0	173 13 0
	Total ...	5,356 2 9	7,031 12 0	12,387 14 9	2,460 9 0	2,131 15 0	4,592 8 0	7,795 6 9
ROHILKHAND.	Bijnor ...	100 8 0	3 6 0	103 14 0	*Nil.*	3 6 0	3 6 0	100 8 0
	Moradabad ...	195 15 7	3,885 11 6	4,081 11 1	31 13 6	105 8 0	137 5 6	3,944 5 7
	Budaun ...	64 8 0	*Nil.*	64 8 0	12 8 0	52 0 0	64 8 0	*Nil.*
	Bareilly ...	176 0 0	142 14 0	318 14 0	45 0 0	41 8 0	86 8 0	232 6 0
	Shahjahánpur ...	*Nil.*	102 15 4	102 15 4	82 0 0	*Nil.*	82 0 0	20 15 4
	Pilibhit ...	*Nil.*	19 4 0	19 4 0	*Nil.*	*Nil.*	*Nil.*	19 4 0
	Total ...	536 15 7	4,154 2 10	4,691 2 5	171 5 6	202 6 0	373 11 6	4,317 6 11
ALLAHABAD.	Cawnpore ...	3,325 5 1	733 9 6	4,058 14 7	950 12 7	850 10 0	1,801 6 7	2,257 8 0
	Fatehpur ...	630 2 0	113 8 0	743 10 0	9 0 0	492 0 0	501 0 0	242 10 0
	Allahabad ...	1,228 4 0	7,177 15 10	8,406 3 10	655 3 3	2,102 15 4	2,758 2 7	5,648 1 3
	Jhánsi ...	87 12 0	915 8 0	1,003 4 0	27 12 0	885 0 0	912 12 0	140 8 0
	Jalaun ...	(d) 217 9 3	1 0 0	218 9 3	218 9 3	*Nil.*	218 9 3	*Nil.*
	Total ...	5,489 0 4	8,941 9 4	14,430 9 8	1,861 5 1	4,280 9 4	6,141 14 5	8,288 11 3
BENARES.	Jaunpur ...	1,270 15 0	3,397 4 0	4,668 3 0	96 2 0	*Nil.*	96 2 0	4,572 1 0
	Ballia ...	119 1 3	221 8 0	340 9 3	66 4 0	*Nil.*	66 4 0	274 5 3
	Mirzapur ...	1,375 14 9	1,054 6 0	2,430 4 9	390 7 3	1,164 14 0	1,555 6 0	874 14 9
	Benares ...	(e) 747 5 0	401 12 0	1,149 1 0	*Nil.*	*Nil.*	*Nil.*	1,149 1 0
	Gházipur ...	808 2 6	1,454 4 3	2,262 6 9	224 9 6	1,373 11 0	1,598 5 3	664 1 6
	Total ...	4,321 0 6	6,529 2 3	10,850 8 9	777 6 9	2,538 10 6	3,316 1 3	7,534 7 6
GORAKHPUR.	Gorakhpur ...	(g) 92 2 0	923 6 0	1,015 8 0	46 4 0	968 12 0	1,015 0 0	0 8 0
	Basti ...	93 8 0	24 15 0	118 7 0	(h) 21 14 0	18 4 0	40 2 0	78 5 0
	Azamgarh ...	818 2 3	900 2 0	1,718 4 3	438 12 0	293 3 0	731 15 0	986 5 3
	Total ...	1,003 12 3	1,848 7 0	2,852 3 3	506 14 0	1,280 3 0	1,787 1 0	1,065 2 3
	Total, N.-W. P....	18,641 2 5	20,946 3 5	48,587 5 10	5,918 9 4	11,433 3 10	17,351 13 2	31,235 8 8
	OUDH.							
LUCKNOW.	Lucknow ..	304 6 0	976 13 3	1,281 3 3	135 11 3	288 14 0	424 9 3	856 10 0
	Unao ...	*Nil.*	201 15 9	201 15 9	103 12 0	*Nil.*	103 12 0	98 3 9
	Rae Bareli ...	67 3 6	105 3 0	172 6 6	33 11 0	46 5 0	140 0 0	32 6 6
	Sitapur ...	253 1 0	344 13 0	597 14 0	225 8 0	231 5 9	456 13 9	171 1 0
	Hardoi ...	37 8 0	27 0 0	64 8 0	64 8 0	*Nil.*	64 8 0	*Nil.*
	Total ...	662 2 6	1,655 18 9	2,318 0 3	562 2 3	566 8 0	1,189 11 0	1,158 5 3
FYZABAD.	Fyzabad ...	209 5 3	1,057 7 0	1,266 12 3	108 4 0	166 9 0	334 13 0	(e) 931 15 3
	Bahraich ...	111 9 0	134 3 9	245 12 9	60 0 0	87 9 0	147 9 0	98 3 9
	Gonda ...	295 0 3	935 1 0	1,230 7 3	267 14 6	42 8 0	310 6 6	920 0 9
	Bara Banki ...	44 11 0	*Nil.*	44 11 0	7 3 0	*Nil.*	7 3 0	37 8 0
	Sultánpur .	996 7 9	934 15 6	1,931 7 3	105 10 0	315 4 0	420 14 0	1,510 9 3
	Part Garh ...	618 13 0	247 4 0	861 1 0	92 12 9	511 14 0	604 10 9	256 6 3
	Total ...	2,271 4 3	3,308 15 3	5,580 3 6	701 12 3	1,123 12 0	1,825 8 3	3,754 11 3
	Total, Oudh ...	2,933 6 9	4,964 13 0	7,928 3 9	1,324 14 0	1,690 4 9	3,015 3 3	4,913 0 6
	Total, N.-W. P and Oudh.	21,604 9 2	34,911 0 5	56,515 9 7	7,243 7 10	13,123 8 7	20,367 0 5	36,148 9 2

(a) Erroneously shown as Rs. 864-3-0 in the previous year.

(b) Collector reports the difference, Rs 8-9-5, as belonging to Meerut district.

(c) Collector says the difference, Rs. 35-15-0, is due to the amount being erroneously shown as stamp dues in the previous year.

(d) The balance was incorrectly shown as Rs. 105-5-3 last year.

(e) Collector says that Rs. 1-14-0 should be excluded from this balance. The Government Pleader received it direct without crediting it into the Treasury. The actual balance is Rs. 930-1-3.

(f) The balance was wrongly shown as Rs. 667 last year.

(g) By an oversight Collector reports that Rs. 1-8-0 costs were not shown in the previous year's statement.

(h) Of this amount Rs 19-8-0 were recovered, but absconded with.

(i) Collector says Rs. 8 were erroneously included last year.

ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT.

No. $\frac{690}{\text{VII}-476\text{B}}$ of 1892.

From

The OFFG. SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT,

N.-W. Provinces and Oudh,

To

The LEGAL REMEMBRANCER to GOVERNMENT,

N.-W. Provinces and Oudh.

Dated Naini Tal, the 27th July 1892.

Sir,

Judicial Dept. (Civil).

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt, on 1st June 1892, of your letter No. $\frac{3018}{\text{P}-568}$, dated 20th May 1892, being your report on Civil Litigation to which the Government, Municipalities or the Court of Wards was a party during the year ending 30th September 1891. It was due in the Secretariat on the 15th May. Your attention has been separately called to a few points on which explanation is required with regard to certain apparent inaccuracies and discrepancies.

2. In the table appended to this review are included the chief statistics bearing on the litigation of the year, both in the lower and in the appellate Courts. As regards cases decided in which the State was a plaintiff or appellant, the low percentage of successful suits in Oudh is due chiefly to the adverse decision or compromise of eight references under the Land Acquisition Act; a similar cause also reduced the percentage in the North-Western Provinces. Though the State lost a large percentage of the cases in which it was a defendant or respondent, the insignificant proportion of the claims decreed against it shows that the claims were, on the whole, successfully resisted. The small proportion of State claims decreed appears to be accounted for, partly by the fact that the total sum claimed includes the value of suits in which compromises were effected, and partly by the inclusion in the claims of sums in dispute under the Land Acquisition Act, which are not actually claimed by the State. Municipalities fared badly in the appellate Courts, the percentage of cases decided, and sums decreed, against them being high. In Court of Wards' litigation, the most noticeable feature is the recovery of 9·7 per cent. only of sums claimed in the North-Western Provinces, due to the dismissal by the Court of the Rámpur State of an appeal relating to more than one lakh of rupees. The figures for realizations of sums due show inferior results in Oudh State cases and in municipal cases.

3. *State litigation—Appendix A.*—In the following remarks the few cases of compromise are counted as successes, and withdrawals as successes or losses according to circumstances. Sixty-eight cases in which the State was plaintiff were decided during the year; twenty, or 29·4 per cent., were lost. Of 37 claims preferred against the State

and decided, 24 were successfully defended, and 13, or 35·1 per cent., established: thus the decisions of the Courts were adverse in 33 cases out of 105: *i.e.*, in 31·4 per cent. Out of these, 17 were cases under the Land Acquisition Act; three were not reported to your office or were instituted against your advice; one decision was upset on appeal and three are under appeal; in two cases the adverse party was only partially successful, and in one the State was merely impleaded as a stake-holder. An explanation is thus forthcoming for 27 out of the 33 defeats. The apparently unsatisfactory fact that only 22 per cent. of the value of claims made by the State in the Courts of first instance was decreed is mentioned by you without explanation: it seems to be due to the causes stated in paragraph 2.

4. Out of 13 appeals decided in the lower appellate Courts three, on the part of the State, were lost. In the superior appellate Courts, the single one decided which had been initiated by Government was compromised. Only one was successfully defended out of a total of five, 20 per cent. of the value of the claims made against the State being established. Two of the four appeals thus lost were under the Land Acquisition Act. In the lower appellate Courts, owing to the loss of one important suit, only 30 per cent. of the claims advanced were recovered.

5. The percentages realized of the total demand on account of sums decreed in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh are exhibited in the following table:—

	1889.	1890.	1891.
North-Western Provinces ...	19	4·5	24·3
Oudh	62	29	5·5
Total ...	21	5	23·0

Of the total demand of Rs. 30,167, the amount realised was Rs. 6,950, leaving a balance, after deducting remissions, of Rs. 19,990. A large portion of this, however, is accounted for by the sum, Rs. 8,298, due from General Thelwall, which is apparently being liquidated in instalments. A further sum of Rs. 846 due from Mr. Nulty has just been written off as irrecoverable. A judgment-debtor in Agra, who owes a considerable sum, is reported to be without means; I am to enquire if the certificate required by rule 8(6) of Circular No. 3 of 1886 was furnished in this case by the Collector, previous to the institution of the suit.

6. *Municipal litigation—Appendix B.*—The number of suits decided during the year to which Municipal Boards were a party was, as usual, inconsiderable, involving, with the exception of one case in Mainpuri, small sums only. As was the case last year, no suits or appeals in which municipalities were engaged were decided in Oudh. Out of 15 decided suits, in which the municipalities of the North-Western Provinces were involved, five were lost. Two of these were contested without reference to your office, while three were insignificant, and filed on inaccurate information collected by the Boards concerned. In lower appellate Courts the success was small, five out

of seven decided appeals terminating adversely. One was time-barred when instituted; two were not referred to your office. Both the appeals decided by the higher appellate Courts proved successful. Only 8 per cent. of the sums due on execution proceedings was collected, as compared with 15 in 1889-90.

7. *Court of Wards' litigation—Appendix C.*—The following table exhibits the result of litigation in Courts of first instance in which the Court of Wards was involved during the year:—

Cases decided in which the Court of Wards was—

	Plaintiff.			*Defendant.*		
	For.	Against.	Total	For.	Against	Total
North-Western Provinces ...	18	1	19	10	4	14
Oudh	114	22	136	35	8	43
Total ...	132	23	155	45	12	57

Out of the 35 claims, equal to 16·5 per cent. of the whole, shown as unsubstantiated by the Court of Wards or proved against them, you give special reasons for the failure in 22 cases; while in two the adverse decisions were reversed on appeal. The preferment by the Court of Wards of small claims, such as two in the Binhora estate with an aggregate value of Rs. 9-2-0, should be avoided unless questions of principle are involved. The litigation in the Surajpur and Khairágarh estates was very heavy; 92 out of the 191 cases for decision in Oudh being connected with them.

8. The figures showing the practical result of the litigation are given below:—

Value of claims in which the Court of Wards was—

	Plaintiff.			*Defendant.*		
	Value of claims preferred.	Decreed.	Percentage decreed	Value of claims defended	Lost.	Percentage lost.
	Rs	Rs		Rs	Rs.	
North-Western Provinces.	14,628	11,582	79	66,135	32,906	49
Oudh	1,45,214	1,08,390	74	75,412	2,589	3
Total ..	1,59,842	1,19,972	75	1,41,547	35,495	25

The ill success of the Court of Wards as defendant in the North-Western Provinces is accounted for by the loss of one suit in which the sum decreed was Rs. 25,347. No details of this important case are given in the report.

9. In first appellate Courts 24 cases were decided, in four of which the decisions (all in cases in which the Court of Wards was appellant) were adverse. Three of these were in the North-Western Provinces, of which one (referred to in paragraph 2) involving a value of Rs. 1,04,000, was decided by the Rámpur Court. The case lost in Oudh involved less than one per cent. of the value in the appeals

preferred. The Oudh estates were involved as respondent in no appeals to the higher Courts of appeal; they recovered (in one case) only 36 per cent. of the value of those preferred by them, being unsuccessful in three other cases. Exclusive of one appeal, in which Rs. 3,16,800 was at stake, and which was compromised, four appeals were defended in the North-Western Provinces; only 63 per cent. of the claims were established, a result due to the loss of one appeal valued at Rs. 6,553.

10. In the North-Western Provinces Rs. 18,364, or 23·6 per cent. of the total sum to be realized in execution of decrees, was recovered; a considerable improvement on the percentage of last year, which was only 8½. Twenty-four per cent. of the demand was realized in Oudh as compared with 31 in the previous year. Of the net outstanding balance, amounting to Rs. 58,363 in the North-Western Provinces, Rs. 5,262 are reported to have been recovered and credited in the Civil Courts before the end of the year; and proceedings were in progress for the realization of Rs. 31,786. There are balances of over Rs. 1,000 shown against the districts of Etáwah, Mainpuri, Bareilly, Jaunpur and Gházipur, as to which no explanation is afforded. It is said with regard to the net outstandings in Oudh, amounting to Rs. 59,700, that proceedings are being taken in regard to about Rs. 47,705. The unexplained balances in Bara Banki (Pokhra estate), Bahraich, Rae Bareli and Sultánpur are considerable.

11. *Recovery of Government dues in pauper suits—Appendix E.*—An addition of Rs. 34,911 to the outstanding balances in pauper suits brought the total to Rs. 56,515, of which Rs. 7,243 (or 13 per cent. as compared with 20 in the previous year) were recovered, and Rs. 13,123 as compared with Rs. 15,793 were expunged as irrecoverable. The largest net balances are in the districts of Agra, Moradabad, Allahabad and Jaunpur.

12. In the following districts, municipalities and estates, suits and appeals shown as pending in 1890 were still pending at the close of 1891:—

	Districts.	Municipalities.	Estates.	
Suits	Muttra. Sháhjahánpur. Kheri. Bijnor.* Lucknow.*	*Etah.*	Ram Saran Das. Nagla Kisi. Mashuk Mahal Begum. *Khamaria.*	Bhikari. Musepur. Murari Lal.* Surajpur.*
First appeals ...	Moradabad.*		Batak Parshad. Lachmi Narain. *Gauri Shankar.* Ram Saran Das.*	Mullanpur.* Khapradih.* Rámpur.* Murari Lal.*
Second appeals ...	Benares. Ballia.*	Cawnpore.*	Harchandpur. Mashuk Mahal Begum. Kurwar. Mahona.	Sambalhera. Murari Lal.* Rámnagar.

In the cases marked with an asterisk the suit or appeal was being defended; italics denote that the suit or appeal was also pending in 1889.

13. In conclusion I am to convey to you the acknowledgments of the Lieutenant-Governor and Chief Commissioner for your careful superintendence of civil litigation during the year.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

W. H. L. IMPEY,

Offg. Secy. to Govt., N.-W. P. and Oudh.

APPENDIX.

	State, Municipality or Court of Wards being plaintiff or appellant.			*State, Municipality or Court of Wards being defendant or respondent.*			*State, Municipality or Court of Wards being plaintiff or appellant.*			*State, Municipality or Court of Wards being defendant or respondent.*			Total demand.	Realised during 1890-91.	Percentage realised.
	Total number of cases shown as decided.	Number decided in favour of plaintiff or appellant.	Percentage of cases decided in favour to total.	Total number of cases shown as decided.	Number decided in favour of defendant or respondent.	Percentage of cases decided in favour to total.	Value of claims shown as decided.	Amount decreed.	Percentage of amount decreed to total value.	Value of claims shown as decided.	Amount decreed.	Percentage of amount decreed to total value.			
							STATE.								
							Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	
North-Western Provinces ...	58	39	67·2	38	19	50·0	55,923	7,976	14·2	6,56,780	8,566	1·3	28,131	6,837	24·3
Oudh	17	6	35·3	11	7	63·6	10,886	1,341	12·3	1,319	324	24·5	2,036	113	5·5
Total ...	75	45	60·0	49	26	53·0	66,809	9,317	13·9	6,58,099	8,890	1·3	30,167	6,950	23·0
							MUNICIPALITIES.								
North-Western Provinces ...	5	3	60·0	19	11	57·9	115	74	64·3	2,155	1,012	46·9	3,349	268	8·0
Oudh	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Total ...	5	3	60·0	19	11	57·9	115	74	64·3	2,155	1,012	46·9	3,349	268	8·0
							COURTS OF WARDS.								
North-Western Provinces ...	22	18	81·8	22	14	63·6	1,19,237	11,582	9·7	3,97,415	39,568	9·9	77,587	18,364	23·6
Oudh	146	117	80·1	55	39	70·9	1,58,893	1,15,648	72·7	93,810	2,589	2·7	82,492	20,160	24·4
Total ...	168	135	80·3	77	53	68·8	2,78,130	1,27,230	45·7	4,91,225	42,157	8·5	1,60,079	38,524	24·0